DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 031 EC 171 740

AUTHOR	Covert, Angela Manetti
TITLE	The Dean's Grant Program: An Approach to Academic Change in Higher Education. Final Program Report.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	84
GRANT	G008201018
NOTE	280p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Fordham University.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Colleges; *Curriculum Development; *Disabilities; *Educational Innovation; *Faculty Development; Federal Legislation; *Higher Education; Organizational Change; Self Evaluation (Groups); Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Deans Grants Program

ABSTRACT

An onsite study of two major program areas (faculty development and curriculum revision) in a national sample of 11 Dean's Grant Program projects sought to increase understanding of how academic innovation and change occur in higher education, and the processes for effectively managing change. Case study methodology was used, and data were obtained from multiple sources, includng document review, consultations, and interviews. Data were analyzed qualitatively, both within-site and cross-site. It was reported that faculty were increasingly aware of and knowledgeable about P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) and, to a lesser extent, had more positive attitudes toward education of the handicapped, and that teacher preparation curricula were being revised to incorporate content on the handicapped largely through infusion of content into already existing courses. Factors which affected the implementation-and-change process were explored in the areas of (1) project leadership and management, and (2) culture and context (institutional features and characteristics). Modifying the incentive-and-reward system for faculty was described as a key strategy in effecting academic innovation and change. (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED254031

THE DEAN'S GRANT PROGRAM:
AN APPROACH TO ACADEMIC CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

ANGELA MANETTI COVERT

Final Program Report: CFDA: 84.023B G008201018

Submitted by:

Thomas A. Mulkeen
Thomas A. Mulkeen
Principal Investigator

Angela M Covert
Angela Manetti Covert
Project Coordinator

Fordham University
Graduate School of Education
Lincoln Center
New York, New York 10023

EC171740

THE DEAN'S GRANT PROGRAM:
AN APPROACH TO ACADEMIC CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

ANGELA MANETTI COVERT

DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
1984

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A study such as this one could not have been undertaken, much less completed, without the support and assistance of many good friends, professional colleagues, and mentors who challenged me to stretch and reach. Grateful thanks and appreciation are extended to all, with but a few identified below.

My appreciation goes to the deans, project coordinators, and faculties who willingly participated in this study and gave of their time and themselves. I thank them for giving me their trust and sharing project information--both the good and the not so good. And, most importantly, I thank them for welcoming me to their campuses with such warmth and graciousness that I felt I was traveling across this country making friends rather than tackling the arduous task of collecting data.

I extend sincere appreciation to Percy Bates, Thomas Behrens, Dean C. Corrigan, Robert Gilberts, George C. Hagerty, Maynard C. Reynolds, Bert Sharp, and Bob G. Woods, key leaders in the Dean's Grant Program who gave of their time, their support, their encouragement, and especially their insights.

As I moved through the amorphous world of qualitative research, it was important to have an anchor, a point for reality testing, and a reflecting screen against which to test impressions, ideas, interpretations, and conclusions. I am grateful to Victor Baldwin for providing that perceptual screen, for sharing his work and expertise, and for his support, assistance, and friendship from the genesis of the idea for this study.

My special thanks go to Ruth M. Kolbe, who gave of herself, her editorial and word processing skills, and her fine aesthetic sense in producing this document. Her superb technical expertise was exceeded only by her generous amounts of patience, good humor, accommodation to frenetic schedules, and real friendship.

And last, but of course not least, Richard and Christopher, without whose support, encouragement, and patience, etc., etc., etc....

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables and Figures vi

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE 1

  Introduction 1

  The Problem 4

  Focus and Purpose of the Study 5

    Focus 5

    Purpose 7

  Organization of the Study 8

    A Note on Terminology 9

I. THE PROBLEM: CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION 11

  The Need to Change/Adapt 11

  Approaches to Change 15

  Conceptual Framework for this Study 19

    Organizational Culture and Context 20

    Leadership and Management 25

    Faculty Development in the Change Process 27

    Incentive and Reward Systems 34

  Summary 35

II. FOCUS OF THE STUDY: THE DEAN'S GRANT PROGRAM 37

  Background for the Dean's Grant Program 37

    Background of PL 94-142 42

    Litigation and Legislation: Forerunners of PL 94-142 43

Page

The Dean's Grant Program 45

Requirements of Dean's Grants 48

National Technical Assistance 50

Policy Context 52

Distinguishing characteristics of the Dean's Grant Program 53
Purpose and intention of the Dean's Grant Program 54

Summary 56

III. METHODOLOGY 58

Approach and Rationale 58

Sample 61

Data Collection Methods 63

Data Analysis 64

Authenticity of the Study 64

Confidentiality 66

IV. THE FINDINGS: DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS 67

The Sites: Brief Descriptions 71

Profiles: Sites 1-11 71

Discussion 80

Leadership and Management 81

Rationale and Motivation for Applying 82

Leadership in Project Initiation 89

Leadership in Project Management 91

Leadership in project management 92
Project coordinator's role and status 93

Page

Perception of the Dean's Role 95

Perception of "Ownership" of the Project 97

Perceptions of project identity 97
Role of faculty in initial stages 99

Summary: Leadership and management 99

Discussion 103

Faculty Development 105

Profiles: Sites 1-11 106

Summary: Faculty Development 131

Scope and focus 131
Objectives 133
Strategies and activities 134
Reported outcomes 136

Discussion 137

Curriculum Revision 140

Profiles: Sites 1-11 143

Summary: Curriculum Revision 155

Scope/focus and target 155
Approach, strategies, and activities 158
Objectives and level of progress achieved . . . 160

Discussion 162

Culture and Context 164

Profiles: Sites 1-11 166

Perceived Mission and Priorities 178

Perceived Effectiveness of Dean's
Grant Projects 179

Summary and Discussion 181

Page

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS 184

Summary 184

Distinguishing Characteristics of the Dean's Grant Program 185

Purpose and Goals 185

Design and Focus 186

Local Initiative 186

Technical Assistance 187

Role of OSEP Staff 187

Summary 187

Conclusions 188

Impact on Faculty Development 188

Impact on Deans 190

Impact on Curriculum Revision 190

Institutionalizing the Change 192

Some Factors Affecting Implementation of Dean's Grant Projects 193

Leadership 193
Culture and context 195

Implications for Change in Higher Education 196

External Environment 197

Change as a Process 199

Leadership and Management 200

Faculty Development 201

Culture and Context 203

Page

Concluding Statement 204

The Dean's Grant Program as an Approach to Change 204

Change in Higher Education 209

BIBLIOGRAPHY 214

APPENDIX 229

ABSTRACT 236

VITA 238

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Tables

Page

3.1 Sample Selection: Projects in Operation, 1982-83 62

3.2 Profile of Sample Sites and Interviewees 65

4.1 Matrix of Projects 70

4.2 Rationale and Motivation for Applying 86

4.3 Summary: Rationale and Motivation for Applying 88

4.4 Leadership in Project Initiation 90

4.5 Leadership in Managing Project 92

4.6 Project Coordinator's Role and Status 94

4.7 Perceptions of Dean's Role 96

4.8 Perceptions of Project Identity 98

4.9 Role of Faculty in Initial Stages 98

4.10 Summary: Leadership and Management 101

4.11 Summary: Scope of Faculty Development 132

4.12 Faculty Development: Objectives 133

4.13 Faculty Development: Strategies and Activities 135

4.14 Summary: Reported Outcomes of Faculty Development 136

4.15 Curriculum Revision: Scope/Focus and Target 156

4.16 Curriculum Revision: Approach, Strategies, and Activities 159

4.17 Curriculum Revision: Objectives and Level of Progress Achieved 161

4.18 Perceived Institutional Mission and Priorities 178

Page

4.19 Perceived Effectiveness of Dean's Grant Project 180

4.20 Ranked Effectiveness Ratings 181

Figures

4.1 Faculty Development: Site #1 107

4.2 Faculty Development: Site #2 110

4.3 Faculty Development: Site #3 113

4.4 Faculty Development: Site #4 115

4.5 Faculty Development: Site #5 117

4.6 Faculty Development: Site #6 119

4.7 Faculty Development: Site #7 121

4.8 Faculty Development: Site #8 124

4.9 Faculty Development: Site #9 126

4.10 Faculty Development: Site #10 128

4.11 Faculty Development: Site #11 130

4.12 Curriculum Revision: Site #1 143

4.13 Curriculum Revision: Site #2 144

4.14 Curriculum Revision: Site #3 145

4.15 Curriculum Revision: Site #4 146

4.16 Curriculum Revision: Site #5 147

4.17 Curriculum Revision: Site #6 148

4.18 Curriculum Revision: Site #7 149

4.19 Curriculum Revision: Site #8 150

4.20 Curriculum Revision: Site #9 151

11

Page

4.21 Curriculum Revision: Site #10 152

4.22 Curriculum Revision: Site #11 153

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Introduction

Educational organizations, including institutions of higher education, face major challenge and change in the years ahead. Key societal trends such as a changing demography, shifts in the national economy from an industrial/manufacturing base to an information service base, the relationship between education and work, and shifting public policy and regulations will affect the way colleges and universities go about their work. The coming decades will be a time of great challenge and change for American higher education, with some of the most powerful forces for change provided by the external environment (Baldridge & Deal, 1983; Cyert, 1983; Hodgkinson, 1983; Keller, 1983).

But the prospect of change is not new for colleges and universities. From the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s, higher education experienced unprecedented growth and change. Partly in response to Sputnik and partly because of increased national concern for equal educational opportunities for minority and other previously underserved students, billions of federal dollars supported new programs to improve educational equity and access at all levels, from preschool through postsecondary. These new emphases and increased resources led to dramatic growth for American higher education.

Within that twenty-year period, the number of students in higher education tripled, physical facilities doubled, college programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels expanded, and the opportunities and demand for college faculties grew accordingly (Keller, 1983). As large numbers of new students, encouraged and supported by federal policies and programs, entered the colleges and universities, post-secondary institutions expanded not only in size, but also in scope. In addition, an expanded basis of support from public and private sources and greatly increased support for research brought large amounts of money onto the campuses and aided in the general growth of higher education.

During this period, much of the stimulus for academic change came from the professionals within academia who had ideas for improving programs in order to address the societal ills of the country (Baldridge & Deal, 1983). New programs were designed, offering a wide variety of options in course content as well as delivery format to meet the needs of new student populations. It was a time of expansion, sufficient resources were available to support the development and growth of the new programs, and managing change in this environment, while complex and challenging, was positive and exciting.

By the mid-1970s, however, institutions of higher education began to face a countertrend from the growth era of the previous two decades. Declining enrollments, escalating costs, an eroding base of support from private and government sources, and continuing expectations from students and society for effectiveness and equitable access presented new challenges to colleges and universities. Educational leaders were faced with managing change in a time of retrenchment and contraction, a difficult and often painful process (Baldridge & Deal, 1983).

Once again, the environment surrounding educational institutions has shifted substantially and higher education is facing a time of even greater challenge and change (Cyert, 1983). The pressure for initiating change has shifted from within the academic community to the external environment. Voluntary improvement programs are giving way to the mandates of public policy, implementing regulations, and public expectations that educational institutions become more accountable and efficient (Baldridge & Deal, 1983; Keller, 1983).

In educational organizations, change is natural, fundamental, and occurs with frequency--sometimes by plan, sometimes by whim, and sometimes inadvertently. The changes may be minute or monumental, but organizations do change. Thus, the questions are not whether colleges and universities do, or should, change, but rather: How is change managed? Is the change planned and directed? What is the extent and effect of the change? Will the change be enduring? How will it affect the institution's survival and quality? In short, can colleges and universities manage and direct change as higher education faces declining resources and shifting societal needs which will require major reforms in programs and faculties with different or expanded competencies (Keller, 1983)?

The Problem

Although postsecondary education has been involved in dramatic growth and innovation for more than two decades, relatively little is known about effectively managing the complex process of implementing change in higher education. Few studies present a comprehensive examination of the implementation of change, but rather have generally focused on specific models of change or narrowly defined areas of study. Little of the research has focused on the organizational processes, institutional factors, and interaction patterns which reflect the realities of their organizations and which are critical to the functioning of an organization and the improvement of practice (NIE, 1980b). What is needed is research that will "address issues of generic effectiveness" (NIE, 1980b, p. 57) and help practitioners determine appropriate models for planning and managing change.

Keller (1983) suggests that higher education is entering a new era that requires "better planning, strategic decision making, and more directed change" (p. 27). More information is needed on the processes by which postsecondary institutions as organizations go about establishing goals, finding resources, and solving their problems, and how these processes are affected by the distinctive historical, cultural, social, political, and academic aspects of life in higher education, as well as by the external influence of the larger society. Understanding the management of change will be critical as educational leaders engage in renewal and change and attend to issues of quality and excellence in an environment in which survival issues will be competing for the attention of the faculty (Cyert, 1980).

The present study addressed this problem by examining the process of implementing change in higher education. The study focused on the complex sets of features which characterize colleges and universities as organizations and those processes which contribute to or impede the implementation of change. The purpose was to add to the knowledge and understanding of implementing and managing change in higher education by providing a comprehensive, indepth exploration of the implementation of a change project at multiple sites.

Focus and Purpose of the Study

Focus

This study examined academic change in higher education, specifically in schools/colleges/departments of education (SCDE). The focus of the study was the Dean's Grant Program (DGP), a program initiated by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to facilitate implementation of PL 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Children's Act. The purpose of the DGP was to assist SCDE to reconceptualize their teacher preparation programs to extend the context and content of regular education to include education of handicapped children. The aim was to prepare all graduates with competencies for providing effective education for all children, including those with handicapping conditions. Implicit in the DGP was the aim of assisting SCDE to renew and revitalize themselves and to strengthen teacher preparation and other programs central to their institutions. This study focused on two program areas found in most DGPs--faculty development and curriculum revision.

From the inception of the DGP in 1975, more than $40 million has been awarded in dean's grants to approximately 275 colleges and universities throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Projects have ranged from one to nine years, usually in three-year cycles, with an average grant of $40,000 per year.

Although the specific approaches and strategies varied with individual institutions, all projects shared a common goal--revising regular teacher preparation programs to incorporate the learning needs of handicapped children and youth. The DGP provided a unique opportunity to study implementation of a change project at multiple sites and, through cross-site analyses, to identify those practices and strategies which were effective or not effective, and to examine the effect of institutional characteristics and processes on the implementation of academic innovation.

Gideonse (1978), in referring to the Dean's Grant Program, has said:

> The foresight of BEH in anticipating the extent and depth of the changes that would be required in teacher education by passage of Public Law 94-142 is so remarkable in the annals of federal policy development and application that it is appropriate to call it both unique and unprecedented. (p. 139)

This unique effort by the federal government to support educational innovation in higher education in order to facilitate implementation of a federal policy provided the focus for examining the process of academic innovation in higher education.

Purpose

One purpose of this study was to add to the knowledge of the process of managing change in higher education by providing a comprehensive study and holistic analysis of the implementation of change. The aim was to contribute to a better understanding of the processes and procedures which support change, those which impede the process, and the effect of the institution's characteristics and processes on the management of change.

Another purpose of the study was to yield information on the efficacy of the DGP as an approach to change, and to identify distinctive features of the program which were or were not supportive of change at the local level. The program staff at OSEP who initiated the DGP recognized that enduring change cannot be imposed by external sources, but must come from within (Behrens, 1979). The objectives, activities, and impact of local projects were defined by those at the participating institutions, based on their perceptions of innovations that would effect changes in their curricula.

The National Support Systems Project (NSSP, 1980), the national technical assistance project of the DGP, reported that two outcomes almost always occurred in dean's grant projects:

1. Faculty development, with an emphasis in early years of the project on faculty awareness and attitudes, advancing to changes in performance and needed collaboration;

2. Curriculum development, which included the development of new courses, the addition of modules to existing courses, or even the revision of the entire program of courses and practica.

Another aim of this study was to assess the extent of change and the impact of the DGP in the two central program areas: (1) curriculum revision designed to include content on education of the handicapped; and (2) faculty development aimed at achieving the desired curriculum revisions. In examining the extent of change, attention was also given to identifying those strategies and practices which were effective or ineffective in achieving the desired changes.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I presents further discussion of the problem of change in higher education. Included are discussions on the need for institutions of higher education and teacher education to change and adapt, the problems of change in higher education, and some approaches to change. Since faculty development is seen as a significant factor in implementing academic change, Chapter I also includes further discussion of faculty development programs.

Chapter II presents further discussion of the DGP, the academic change program used as the focus of the study. Background material and policy context of the DGP, as well as a discussion of the characteristics of the program are presented. The research methodology and design used in the study are presented in Chapter III. The rationale for using case-study research, selection of the institutions included in the sample, and data collection and analysis methods are discussed.

Subsequent chapters present findings and cross-site analyses of the study along four major thematic areas: leadership and management; faculty development; curriculum revisions; and organizational culture and context. The final chapter presents summary, conclusions, and implications.

A Note on Terminology

A number of key terms are used frequently throughout the study and are defined here for the reader's clarification.

Dean's Grant Program (DGP). This refers to the national program as initiated at the federal level.

Project or site. These terms are used interchangeably and refer to the individual local projects and institutions included in the study. Often, project or site is followed by a number (e.g., #1) and refers to a specific project, as defined in Chapter IV.

Model. This is used to indicate a program of activities as one illustration or approach; in this study it is not intended to convey exemplar or standard.

Case study. In this study, the case is defined as the national Dean's Grant Program.

Mini-case study. This refers to the thick descriptions of the eleven individual projects included in the study, which together contribute to the composite case study of the DGP.

Schools/colleges/departments of education (SCDE). This refers to the schools of education, colleges of education, or departments of education which comprise the focus of the study.

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). This refers to the U.S. Department of Education agency which sponsors the DGP. Although this agency was known as the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped (BEH) at the time the DGP was initiated, for purposes of clarity it is referred to as OSEP throughout the study.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Need to Change/Adapt

That educational institutions at all levels, including colleges and universities, must change and adapt to new challenges in the coming decades has become a strong, recurring theme in the public media and the political arena, as well as in educational and professional circles. Presidential commissions, public task forces, private research groups, educational leaders, and political hopefuls all point to the critical need for educational institutions to improve teaching and learning in elementary through postsecondary education to respond to changing societal needs (Baldridge & Deal, 1983; Cyert, 1983; Hodgkinson, 1983; Keller, 1983; Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Education Commission of the States, 1983; The Twentieth Century Fund, 1983). Education has become a more visible national issue and educational institutions are being asked to meet new challenges.

Other challenges presented by major societal trends and shifts will have a profound effect on colleges and universities. The rapid shift in the United States economy from an industrial/manufacturing base to an information/service society base will significantly affect the nature of the work force and the skills needed to compete in a world marketplace. An increasing proportion of the work force will provide information or services (currently 65% as compared with 20% engaged in the manufacturing of products) and will require higher levels of intellectual skills, including the abilities for critical thinking, problem solving, evaluation, analysis, creativity, and communication skills in many modes (Hodgkinson, 1983). The explosion in the use of technology and computers will provide new challenges and opportunities in the educational process as well as in the world of work.

Demographic shifts will also present new challenges to colleges and universities. By the 1990s, the pool of high school graduates will decrease by about 20% (Cyert, 1983), causing greater competition for decreasing numbers of traditional students. Changes in programs will be required to meet the interests and needs of a different student clientele as the population shifts from the North and East to the South and West, the number of minority group members in the student clientele increases, and increasing numbers of adults enter or reenter higher education. The continued escalation of educational costs will result in larger numbers of students attending college on a part-time basis, taking longer periods to complete their work and requiring more flexible scheduling.

Another key trend of note is the growth of a whole new array of providers of education and training for adults. Colleges and universities will no longer have the exclusive option of providing postsecondary education. Business and industry annually spend billions of dollars in training and education for their employees at all levels, from the beginning clerk to senior managers. For example, in 1981, AT&T spent $1.7 billion on education and training (Hodgkinson, 1982). In addition, the military services, government agencies, unions, professional associations, and private training centers are increasingly providing training and educational programs for their constituencies. Thus, colleges and universities find themselves in competition with each other for a declining population of traditional-aged students, and with a whole range of other agencies not previously considered part of the educational enterprise for the nontraditional student.

Another problem facing colleges and universities is attracting the best and the most brilliant young scholars to their faculties, not only because of few openings and limited growth potential, but also because of the increased demand by business and industry for these bright young people. The career potential, higher salaries, and prestige of working in the business world are becoming increasingly attractive to young scholars who might in earlier years have sought a career on university faculties.

SCDEs, the focus of this study, as one part of a larger context of higher education, are vulnerable to the same internal problems and even more vulnerable to the external forces. Each new wave of criticism of the American schools is accompanied by demands for reform in the way educational personnel are prepared. Implementation of public policies and programs generated at the federal level, which then interact with state and local policies, practices, and procedures, often places new demands on educational personnel, requiring new competencies for meeting the mandates of the new program. In turn, the institutions preparing those educators are faced with the need to reform and revitalize their programs.

In the most recent reports on the status of American public education (Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Education Commission of the States, 1983; The Twentieth Century Fund, 1983), reform and improvement in teacher education is again called for. Although the primary focus of these reports is elementary and secondary education, each points to the problems relating to teacher quality and the need for substantial improvement in teacher preparation programs. While teacher education programs alone cannot be held responsible for the state of education in the public schools, the challenges to them become clear: the need to reform and restructure their education personnel preparation programs, and to upgrade their curricula so that their graduates will be prepared to maintain higher standards in the schools.

In an era of shifting public policies and expectations, limited resources, and continuing demand from students and the public for equity and excellence in education, teacher preparation programs are faced with a continuing challenge for change and renewal in preparing their students.

> Society demands a new breed of teacher--a well prepared, highly motivated professional capable of understanding a broad range of learning problems and of designing and implementing curricular and institutional strategies to solve them. (Howsam et al., 1976, p. 80)

The SCDE are faced with the challenge of renewal to prepare such teachers.

Approaches to Change

The literature on change in educational organizations offers many differing approaches to the change process. Some suggest that change is adopted by the organizations rather than by individuals, and thus change efforts should focus on organizational factors (Baldridge, 1978; Baldridge & Burnham, 1975). Others see change as a highly personal process and suggest that change efforts should focus on individuals (Hall, 1978). Still others see change as involving both the individual and the setting in which the change effort is carried out (Arends & Arends, 1978; Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Lindquist, 1978; Schein, 1972).

Baldridge (1975, 1980) tends to view colleges as political institutions, and sees the implementation of change or innovation as a political act. He suggests that, while politics may not seem a normal part of the educational scene, successful innovation requires political skills, strategies, and marshalling of resources. He points out that new programs are not born into a vacuum but must compete with old programs for support, resources, and administrative attention. New programs also often "step on toes," invade or threaten traditional domains, and threaten or upset powerful people with vested interests. Educators need to understand the political process, the different interest groups and the impact of external interest groups, and the wise utilization of extra resources, including money, to implement change successfully.

Recently, Baldridge and Deal (1983) suggested that educational organizations are composed of loosely coupled systems or subunits. The parts, loosely connected and responsive to each other, also maintain their own identity and some separateness. Goals and roles, intentions and outcomes, structure and activity, while somewhat connected, tend to operate quasi-independently.

> Each serves a purpose; but often the purposes are political or symbolic rather than instrumental. [For example] reorganizing signals new ideas and values even when it makes very little difference in day-to-day efficiency. (p. 8)

In another approach to change, the individual users and nonusers are viewed as key to the success or failure of an innovation. Hall (1978) points out that change is a process, not an event subject to rational decision making, anticipation, and planning. Hall's model, The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), views the change process within formal organizations as involving individuals in two key dimensions of the change process, moving through seven stages of "concern about the innovation" and eight "levels of use of the innovation." He hypothesizes that there is a corresponding relationship between the individual's concern about an innovation and its adoption and use. Hall says that change is made by individuals first, then by institutions, and that change is a highly personal experience entailing developmental growth in feelings and skills. He further suggests that change can be carefully planned and facilitated in personalized ways that will increase effectiveness and reduce the trauma usually associated with educational change.

Hall sees an important role for the change facilitator, who must be a skillful, sensitive, and thinking person and who must function in a highly adaptive, systematic, and personalized way if change is to occur efficiently and effectively. The facilitators who view change as a process and focus their efforts on the individuals making the change--their changing concerns, needs, satisfactions, and behaviors--have an increased chance to make change effective and lasting. Lasting, meaningful change is a difficult process requiring a heavy investment of time, effort, and energy. Hall says change in higher education is neither simple nor easy, but he further suggests that planned change can become the norm for colleges and universities.

Other writers view the success or failure of change not to be totally dependent on the skills of the individuals who do the work but, instead, associated with the characteristics of the organizations, environments, and contexts in which the innovation is carried out (Arends & Arends, 1978; Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Lindquist, 1978; Schein, 1972). In a direct reference to Dean's Grant projects, Arends and Arends (1978) point out that the arrangements and environments used to implement teacher education need to merge the goals of regular and special education. They suggest that a "conceptual map" for understanding the change process would include a focus on the human systems --the way people behave both individually and in groups, and the ways in which groups function and interact. The map also includes recognition that change occurs simultaneously at many levels and that change at one level often requires change at another level. Durable change requires a long-term design for strengthening processes for communication, increasing capabilities for decision making, creating a feeling of "ownership" among participants, and strengthening or creating new reward systems.

Schein (1972) sees the planned change process focused on the individual's learning new concepts, ideas, attitudes, values, and patterns of behaviors and skills and, thereby, transforming the social system. The essence of the change process involves a balance between disconfirmation of the old beliefs (creating the need or motivation for change) and the psychological safety to adopt and try new beliefs. For change to be successful, it must be congruent with the culture of the system it is trying to change. Schein suggests that inventing one's own solution to a problem may be slower than adopting someone else's, but it will be more likely to fit the culture and hence more likely to survive.

In one of the few studies of change in higher education, Lindquist (1978) sees change as a local development that is stimulated by the adaptation of external innovations rather than the invention of new ones. Factors of his approach, which he describes as "Adaptive Development," include interpersonal and information linkages, active and effective leadership, "ownership" on the part of participants, and a system of psychic and material rewards for participants. He suggests that perhaps the key to successful innovation in higher education is the development of "new criteria, standards and indicators of professional performance" (p. 258).

Lindquist suggests that the dissemination of an innovative model for adaptation elsewhere, particularly models for change concerning human interaction innovations such as curriculum revision, should be described in basic concepts designed to assist local development of a model to fit the existing values, interests, structures, and behaviors as much as possible.

In summary, different writers view the change process in different ways. But what is clear is that change is a long and slow process involving a heavy investment of time, energy, and commitment, and the careful, skillful, sensitive leadership of a change manager.

Conceptual Framework for this Study

The basic premise of this study is that change is a comprehensive, interactive process involving individuals as well as organizational and environmental factors. The essence of this approach views the individual as being in constant interaction with his/her human and organizational environment, learning new concepts, ideas, attitudes, values, skills, and patterns of behavior. Effective implementation of academic innovation also depends on the characteristics of the organization, the environment, the contexts or cultures in which the innovation is carried out, and the motivational factors in initiating the change process. In this study, several factors are considered critical to the implementation of a change project and comprise the major foci of the study: congruence with the culture of the system it is trying to change; active and effective management and leadership of the change effort; effective faculty development programs; and the incentive and reward system, including both intrinsic and material rewards for participants. Each of these factors is discussed briefly.

Organizational Culture and Context

The importance of culture for organizational change is underscored in current writings on organizations (Baldridge & Deal, 1983; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1983). Baldridge and Deal (1983) say that "if anything in an organization is stable, it is the culture--the values, symbols, and rituals of the workplace" (p. 2). A culture evolves slowly over time, and can act as a counterbalance to keep an organization from changing too rapidly; that is, unless the culture places premium value on innovation, and the emphasis is on changing rather than on the change. Change efforts will interact with the setting--the goals, history, customs, values, roles, and traditions. If change is to occur and to be more than cosmetic, knowledge of and fit with culture becomes critical. Thus, in implementing change it becomes very important to understand the culture and context of institutions of higher education--their history, traditions, values, characteristics, and organizational structures and processes.

Implementing change in colleges and universities as places where learning and research take place and as organizations in which people live and work is, at best, a complex process. Because of their historical function to advance learning and knowledge, their traditional organizational structures and processes, and their unique and complex characteristics, colleges and universities as organizations are resistant to planned changes (Baldridge, 1975, 1978; Lindquist, 1974, 1978; NIE, 1980a,b; Schein, 1972; Ylvisaker, 1980). Ylvisaker (1980) says that the "university is one of the most resistant organizations to change" (p. 72).

Lindquist (1974) recognizes the complexity of higher education organizations and identifies seven possible barriers to academic innovation: (1) major academic changes threaten secure positions and may clash with established behaviors, norms, and values; (2) each subgroup of higher education--administration, faculty, and students --has its own vested interests, often in conflict with the others; (3) academic power to effect change is dispersed among the subgroups as well as external groups; (4) academic traditions and values are resistant to change; (5) measuring long-range importance of an innovation over current practice is difficult; (6) faculty are usually tied to their substantive disciplines and removed from new knowledge about the teaching/learning processes; and (7) internal organizational inertia (p. 327). Lindquist says that, under the circumstances, academic innovation is difficult if not unlikely.

As organizations, colleges and universities are distinguished from most other kinds of organizations by: (1) goals which are often unclear and contested--almost anything can be challenged and/or justified; (2) serving clients who demand input in the decision-making processes, rather than producing a product and working for profits;

(3) problematic technology--serving their clients requires a nonroutine technology; (4) a work force dominated by professionals who demand a large amount of control over the institutional decision-making processes; and (5) increasing vulnerability to external pressures (Baldridge, 1978).

One of the organizational processes in colleges and universities which affects the change process is their governance. Baldridge (1978) describes university governance as a political model characterized by: limited numbers of key individuals involved in policy making; fluid participation in decision-making processes with individuals moving in and out of those roles; numbers of small interest groups with different and often competing goals and priorities; conflict as a normal part of university life; limited authority so that decisions must often be negotiated or compromised; and vulnerability to external or environmental pressures.

Cohen and March (1974) offer similar perceptions of the features of universities which they term "organized anarchies." In their view, "organized anarchies" are characterized by: (1) problematic preferences--inconsistent and ill-defined preferences which might better be described as a loose collection of ideas rather than as a coherent mission; (2) unclear technology which is often not understood by its members and operates on a trial-and-error basis; and (3) fluid participation in which participants vary in the amount of time and effort devoted to institutional processes.

They suggest that such organizations can be viewed for some purposes as

> collections of choices looking for problems, issues and feelings looking for decision situations in which they might be aired, solutions looking for issues to which they may be an answer, and decision makers looking for work. (Cohen & March, 1974, p. 81).

In this model, individual participants (e.g., faculty) make individual decisions (e.g., what to teach) with minimal regard to a clearly stated overall goal. Institutional decisions are not so much made as happen. Leaders (presidents and deans) do not so much lead as serve as catalysts, channeling activities in subtle ways, negotiate rather than command, and facilitate the ongoing rather than introduce bold new programs or directions.

A less cynical view of the uniqueness of colleges and universities is offered by Millett (1978) in a discussion three characteristics peculiar to the academic enterprise which distinguish it from other organizations:

1. The learning process, a highly complex and individualized process concerned with conserving and advancing learning, which involves relationships and interactions between students and faculty. The learning process is not a technology that can be mandated by "top management," and thus the individual faculty members exercise substantial authority in planning and managing this process.

2. The economics of a productive enterprise that does not charge the full costs of its services to its clients (students). Rather, it obtains a substantial part of its resources from society--either in

private contributions, government-sponsored work, or tax-levied support.

3. The role of the faculty who, because of their professional expertise and competence, demand and exercise a major role in the management of the institution's policy- and decision-making processes.

As a result, colleges and universities have a high degree of autonomy or decentralization of the production units (academic departments), a high degree of centralization in the performance of support services, and the need for strong linkages with society.

This model can be described as the university collegium, or community of scholars, in which all members of the academic community, especially the faculty, share fully in all decisions and institutional management. This model presupposes a community of equals, of professionals with authority to make individual decisions free from organizational constraints, and institutional decisions arrived at by consensus.

Keller (1983) suggests that, in the current environment, a new form of campus governance is emerging. As educational leaders become more active as managers, and as decisions need to be made swiftly, some of the distinctions between faculty (academic) and administrative (financial) decision domains are being erased and a new kind of "cabinet government" is taking shape. While presidents need, and want, to be able to move quickly, they still want faculty advice, and want to have someone with whom to share responsibility or blame. Faculty, especially senior ones, still want to have a role in deciding the institution's--and their own--future, but not with full responsibility.

The typical faculty or academic senates, too cumbersome and slow-moving to be effective in this environment, are rapidly losing whatever power they had. Thus, a new form of governance is usually composed of selected senior faculty and key administrators, with some junior faculty, students, and, in some instances, trustees. This body, which is generally chaired by the chief academic officer and advises the president on key issues, is becoming the power center on many campuses. To some extent, it blends the collegial and political views of campus governance.

Leadership and Management

> We cannot afford to be dilettantish or partial about planned change in organizational behavior. If we do not take charge of the development and implementation of our futures, either inertia of the past or the vagaries of the forces around us will dictate our actions. (Lindquist, 1978b, p. 223)

Berman and McLaughlin (1975), reporting on the massive Rand studies of federal programs supporting educational change indicated that, while a receptive institutional setting was essential for effective implementation of an innovation, it alone was not sufficient. They saw implementation of an innovation as an "organizational process that [implies] interactions between the project and its setting; thus it is neither automatic nor certain" (p. 10), but requires an implementation strategy.

The need for more directed planning and management of change in colleges and universities is underscored by Keller (1983) who suggests that these institutions need to plan for the forces of change affecting them, and to construct an active, change-oriented management style.

One requirement set by OSEP in awarding a DGP, the focus of this study, was that the dean or head of teacher education serve as the project director. This requirement was based on the premise that the power to promote change is invested in the role of the dean, and that in order to bring about change it was necessary to have the overt support of someone with status, authority, and decision-making capability. The importance of key leaders in effecting change is strongly supported in the literature on change. Baldridge (1975) found that "organizational position and role--those who had power, sanctions, communication linkages, and boundary roles were highly influential in the adoption of innovation" (p. 169). Lindquist (1974) also points out the need for an innovation to be linked to "campus authorities" (p. 328) in order to attain organizational adoption.

The complexity of adoption or diffusion of innovation throughout an organization is noted by both Baldridge (1975) and Lindquist (1974). In higher education, the complexity of the decision-making process and the multiple chains of command necessary to adopt an innovation make it a complex process. Lindquist suggests that campus leaders interested in innovation must find ways to strengthen linkages between diverse campus individuals, power centers, and "innovative diffusion channels," the opinion leaders. Unless there are linkages between the informal opinion leaders--those initiating or supporting an innovation--and the formal leaders in the academic governance power centers, innovation may exist only in the minds of the innovators.

The importance of administrative experience (leadership) on change efforts is reaffirmed by Baldridge and Deal (1983) in recent writings. They say that, while it may be described as "flying by the seat of one's pants," administrative intuition, the subtle voice from the soul, needs to be heeded. "Research is helpful to challenge, reinforce, or supplement intuition, but theory and research can never replace the wisdom of a seasoned administrator" (p. 8).

Faculty Development in the Change Process

> Since higher education is what is often referred to as a "labor-intensive industry," it stands to reason that developing the workers in the industry ought to be one of the major goals in any program designed to bring about change. (Hipps, 1982, p. 49)

Much has been written about faculty development as an important approach or strategy for instructional improvement (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Ducharme, 1981; J. Gaff, 1975; Gaff, Festa & Gaff, 1978; Lindquist, 1978; Schein, 1972). Traditionally, faculty have been hired on the basis of their individual competence, their own particular areas of expertise. Their identities and loyalties are often as strong with their academic disciplines and colleagues in their fields as with their places of employment. In organizations where the work force is dominated by professionals, as in academic institutions, there is a strong commitment to the norm of work autonomy. In higher education, this norm is supported and reinforced by the tradition of protection of academic freedom. Yet, the faculty must be key actors in any organizational change or innovation.

In a time of expansion, institutions concerned about retaining vitality in the faculty and responding to emerging fields of study would hire bright, young, energetic faculty who brought with them fresh new ideas and perspectives (Christenson, 1982; Ducharme, 1981; J. Gaff, 1975). However, this option is no longer available as the growth period has ended and institutions are faced with increasingly heavily tenured, aging faculties.

Faculty find themselves in a tight job market with limited career opportunities for career advancement either through moving to another institution or through tenure and promotion in their own institutions (Ducharme, 1981; J. Gaff, 1975). Thus, tenured faculty, frustrated by severely restricted career mobility, are staying in the same positions in the same institutions for much longer periods of time (Christenson, 1982; Ducharme, 1981; J. Gaff, 1975; Hipps, 1982).

Faculty are being asked not only to keep current with their disciplines, but also to develop new skills, such as using educational technology and, in some instances, to develop second careers in allied fields (Christenson, 1982). In some instances, faculty find themselves in programs or departments faced with survival issues and with opportunities to move elsewhere virtually nonexistent. In other instances, faculty are facing changing and sometimes conflicting demands. They are expected to continue the scholarly activities of research and publication, maintain enrollment in their courses, develop new programs for nontraditional students, and provide service to the university and as well as the community.

Faculty in teacher education programs are particularly vulnerable to the forces of change. As the need for educational personnel decreases, accompanied by lowered esteem for the profession, and as enrollments decline, SCDE become easy targets for the budget cutters.

Thus, with limited opportunity for hiring new faculty and the limited mobility for existing faculty, the pressures for change place a greater emphasis on professional development of the faculties who are in place. Institutions are faced with the challenge of engaging their faculties in a process of instructional change and revision that will enhance institutional survival and quality, as well as advance their own professional reputations (Keller, 1983).

It would appear, then, from both institutional and faculty perspectives, that faculty development would be a potent force in the change process leading to faculty and institutional revitalization.

The faculty development movement, which gained prominence in the 1970s, was influenced by a parallel development in the social sciences. Psychologists began to look at the adult years as another stage in the human development life span process (Gaff, Festa & Gaff, 1978). Adults were seen, not as finished products, but as human beings capable of personal growth and development, of learning new skills, growing, and changing while passing through some predictable stages. The concept that adults can grow and learn, and can learn new ways of relating to their work and environment, provides a basis for effective faculty development (Gaff, Festa & Gaff, 1978; Woods, 1982).

In the past decade, a number of faculty development practices have been used--seminars, sabbaticals, research grants, visiting scholars, travel grants, annual teaching awards, media and technology--to assist faculty in improving their teaching and research skills (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Centra, 1978; Ducharme, 1981; J. Gaff, 1975). In a study of faculty development practices used by 756 colleges and universities, Centra (1978) identified four groups of practices. The first, high faculty involvement, tended to involve a high proportion of faculty. Some of the practices in this group included workshops, seminars, programs focused on institutional topics or educational trends; consultation or "mentoring" by senior faculty; or workshops to assist faculty in improving their teaching competency. The second group was instructional assistance practices, which included specialist assistance and other activities to assist faculty in instructional and course development, in using instructional media and technology, and in evaluating students. The third group, traditional practices, included sabbaticals, visiting scholars, annual awards for teaching, grants for research, instructional improvement, and travel. In the fourth group, the emphases are on assessment of instructional programs and of faculty by colleagues and students. Although the third group, traditional practices, seems to have been most widely used, some practices have been effective with some faculty; other practices have been effective in other situations.

While the Centra study (1978) identifies the widespread use of faculty development activities, individual activities do not constitute a faculty development program. As an effective change strategy, J. Gaff (1975), Bergquist and Phillips (1975), and Ducharme (1981) advocate a comprehensive approach to faculty development that addresses the personal and professional aspects of a faculty member's growth, and also includes a focus on organizational development.

Comprehensive models of faculty renewal include three major foci: (1) faculty development that focuses on the faculty members and seeks to promote individual growth in attitudes, knowledge, skills, and sensitivity; (2) instructional development that focuses on courses or curriculum designed to improve the conditions of student learning; and (3) organizational development that focuses on the organization or subunit and seeks to create a more effective environment for teaching and learning, professional relationships, and management of the change process (J. Gaff, 1975; Bergquist & Phillips, 1975).

Ducharme (1981) also suggests a comprehensive model that includes a focus on the personal as well as professional growth of the faculty. He defines professional growth as focused on scholarship and instructional needs, with the goal being the improvement of teaching, advising, and research skills. Personal development is seen as personal growth within the organization.

The reasons for resistance to faculty development programs are many, ranging from lethargy to the view that such programs impinge on academic freedom (Woods, 1982). Lack of funds for the necessary resources--for example, consultants, materials, travel, retreats--is another reason often given (Woods, 1982). In addition, while faculty may agree in principle that faculty development is important, it is frequently seen as being for "others"--those others in need of improving their skills (Ducharme, 1981).

This is a particular issue for faculty in education departments who are frequently seen by colleagues in other departments as "second-rate" citizens. They are often viewed as inferior in their knowledge base, training, and ability and as lacking in the scholarly activities of research and publication (Ducharme, 1981). Thus, education faculty who may feel the need to gain academic respectability within their institutions may lack the assurance to engage in faculty development activities, which could be construed as explicit indication of their deficiencies.

Faculty, although resistant, will change when (1) they have the motivation to change--when there is "disconfirmation" of current practice and they believe change is desirable; (2) they have knowledge about alternatives and believe they can change in the desired ways; (3) they have positive feedback and the psychological safety to try something new; and (4) they are praised, recognized, and rewarded for effectiveness and improvement (J. Gaff, 1975; Lindquist, 1978; Schein, 1972).

Using faculty development as a major strategy for effecting institutional change, while a potent vehicle, is also a complex one.

> The foremost reality to be confronted is that there are no shortcuts to design and implementation of a program that will bring about significant changes in people and thus institutions. (Hipps, 1982, p. 50)

One of the first tasks is to determine the purpose of the faculty development program--towards what end the faculty are being developed.

One theme that recurs in the literature (Ducharme, 1981; Hipps, 1982; Schein, 1972; Woods, 1982) is the need for faculty development programs to be consistent with institutional mission, goals, and priorities. The mission must be agreed to, clearly articulated, and consistent in its application--in other words, a congruence between "espoused theory" and "theory-in-action." For example, if the institutional mission supports excellence in teaching but gives rewards to research and publication, the faculty receive conflicting messages and the resultant situation is not conducive to effective faculty development.

Efforts to improve the functioning of an organization, to create a climate supportive of individual growth and development, and respectful of diverse skills and work patterns, may involve modifying existing policies and practices. J. Gaff (1975) suggests that perhaps the best approach to effective faculty and instructional development may be a well-administered university, with clearly stated and well-implemented policies.

As institutions face the need to adapt to a changing student market, finding effective ways to engage faculty in a process that will lead to the development of new ideas, concepts and knowledge, new attitudes and value orientations, new skills, and new patterns of roles and relationships may be one of the most critical challenges facing educational leaders. Institutional health, and perhaps survival, may well depend on it.

Incentive and Reward Systems

A recurring theme in the literature on change is the need for the institutional formal and informal reward systems to support faculty involvement in academic innovation; but, most often, the rewards are intrinsic rather than real. Ducharme (1981), Gaff (1975), and Jabker and Halinski (1978) point out the discrepancy that exists in many institutions which encourage faculty to participate in the development and implementation of innovative programs while retaining the traditional criteria of research and publication as major determinants in tenure and promotional decisions.

In a study of an instructional development program which had the institution's encouragement and financial support, Jabker and Halinski (1978) found that the rewards to participating faculty were more informal (i.e., intrinsic and personal) than formal (i.e., salary, promotion, and tenure). They found that, over the five-year period of the project, there was a significant decline in the percentage of faculty participating in the regular academic year, and hypothesized that, when faculty felt that the potential risks and costs were greater than the potential benefits, they discontinued participation. Jabker and Halinski suggest that

> only if...faculty renewal programs are accorded a status in the reward system equal to that of scholarly productivity, is it likely that the rewards for improving instruction be greater than the costs...and only then will such programs become effective vehicles of significant change in higher education. (p 328)

Hipps (1982) suggests that, for faculty development programs to be effective, there must be extrinsic as well as intrinsic rewards, and these rewards must be tied into the real as well as the published reward systems. Or, as Woods (1982) says:

> if good teaching is not rewarded, then faculty members will be reluctant to expend the time and effort to revise their courses and improve the quality of their teaching. It is human nature to emphasize activities that are rewarded. (p. 65)

Summary

Institutions of higher education are facing complex, and often contradictory, pressures to change. On the one hand, they are being asked to restructure and renew their programs to be more responsive to the changing job markets, to update their curricula to reflect advances in knowledge and technology, and to devise programs responsive to a more diverse student population with a wider range of abilities, needs, and interests. On the other hand, colleges and universities are facing declining enrollments, reduction in public and private financial support, and increasing pressures from legislatures, certifying agencies, and the public for more efficient management and accountability. Colleges and universities are being asked to preserve or strengthen their best programs while simultaneously developing in new areas and directions, all within the context of a steady or decreasing resource base (Christenson, 1982; Hipps, 1982; Keller, 1983).

As higher education faces an era of contraction and retrenchment, academic leaders will be faced with a major challenge to preserve the integrity of their institutions and to keep faculty attention focused on maintaining quality and excellence in an environment where issues of survival will be competing for attention (Cyert, 1980; NIE, 1980b). Managing these institutions as they go about establishing goals, finding resources, supporting and developing their faculties, and solving their problems will require careful planning and creative leadership.

CHAPTER II

FOCUS OF THE STUDY:

THE DEAN'S GRANT PROGRAM

> Changing human behavior can be a long, laborious process. Changing major societal institutions often appears an impossibility. Yet, education finds itself in an era mandating significant change....The courts and Congress, to a large extent, have provided the impetus for this change effort. (Grosenick & Reynolds, 1978, p. 7)

Background for the Dean's Grant Program

In this study of academic change in higher education, the focus is on schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDE). Specifically, the focus for the study is the Dean's Grant Program (DGP), a program initiated by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to facilitate implementation of PL 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. The purpose of the DGP was to assist SCDE to reconceptualize their teacher preparation programs to prepare all graduates with competencies for providing effective education for all children, including those with handicapping conditions.

Passage of PL 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act, in 1975 mandated major reform in the way schools educate handicapped children, with profound implications for the education of all children. As a result of the Law, every handicapped child has the right to a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment--an education that is individualized to his/her needs and, wherever possible, in settings with nonhandicapped classmates. The Law also provides for the guarantee of due process and parent involvement in the evaluation and placement of students.

The impact of the Law on public schools was clear and direct. The schools must comply with the mandates of the Law to provide a free and appropriate public education for all handicapped children in the least restrictive environment. The federal mandates have been augmented by a series of class-action suits challenging the delivery of services by schools; as, for example, the Nickerson decision of 1979 requiring the New York City Board of Education to complete evaluation and placement of handicapped children within 30 days, or the Jose P. decision which required "mainstreaming" of predominantly black and hispanic males who had been labeled as emotionally disturbed. In addition, parent and advocate groups continue to grow, adding to the pressures on schools to provide the services.

Responding to the new mandates in the education of handicapped children required new modes of teaching and, in fact, meant changes in education for all children. Teachers in regular classrooms had to be prepared with an extended range of teaching, diagnostic, and classroom management skills to provide high quality education to groups of children with an expanded range of educational needs. Special education personnel also were required to function in new ways, in closer working relationships with regular educators, providing important resources and consultant services. Where regular and special education had been distinct and separate, the traditional boundaries had to be bridged to provide effective education for all children including those who were handicapped. Meeting the demands of the Law required teachers who were highly competent in their own specialties and who could assume new roles in establishing mutually supportive relationships with colleagues, parents, and students in providing effective education for all children.

Approximately 4.23 million handicapped students are enrolled in America's public schools. Approximately 68% of those students identified as having some handicapping condition spend at least some portion of the school day in regular classrooms. Another 25% who manifest more severe handicaps are educated in self-contained classrooms in public schools (Hagerty, Behrens & Abramson, 1982). Clearly, the vast majority of handicapped children and youth receive their education in the public schools. While the handicapped represent only a small minority of the public school population, implementing the Law has implications for the education of all children.

> With the strong legal preference toward the placement of handicapped students with nonhandicapped peers, mainstreaming is much more than fad or trend. It is a delivery system for education which undoubtedly will be with us for a long period of time. Further, it is consistent with the American value system which is largely based on the premises of equality and the dignity of man. Thus, the movement has strong legal and philosophical roots which dictate changes in schools and universities. (National Support Systems Project, p. 18)

Although the impact of the law had only indirect effect on colleges and universities preparing the teachers, the implications were profound. Reconceptualizing teacher preparation programs to include the learning needs of the handicapped as an integral part of the curriculum, and preparing educators for the new roles indicated by the mandates of PL 94-142 required widespread change in teacher preparation programs. Bringing about the needed changes presented challenges to the education faculties to examine and renegotiate their own organizational structures and processes. The often impermeable boundaries between departments, the "turfdom" of content and courses, the formal and informal incentive and reward systems, the resource allocation processes, and the administrative structures were subject to examination and change. Teacher preparation programs were faced with the challenge of equipping their graduates with a relevant set of competencies to function in the classrooms and to meet the new demands of providing education for groups of children with wider diversity in abilities and needs.

Recognizing that the mandates of the law could be fully realized "only if fundamental changes in the preparation of teachers [were] brought about" (Behrens & Grosenick, 1978, p. 4), in 1974 the Office of Special Education Programs initiated the Dean's Grant Program. The purpose of this program was to encourage and assist schools/colleges/ departments of education to reconceptualize teacher preparation programs, to extend the context and content of regular education, to reform training sequences and curricula to prepare classroom teachers and other educators with competencies for serving a population of children with a wider range of individual abilities, needs, and differences--to provide effective education for all children, including those with handicapping conditions. Deans of education throughout the nation were invited to submit proposals for projects that would investigate alternative approaches and solutions to the various problems involved in change in teacher preparation programs.

Federal support for change and improvement in teacher education was not new with the DGP. The previous two decades had seen the National Defense Education Act programs of the early 1960s, the Education Professions Development Act (1967) programs, and a variety of programs to increase the number of educational personnel to work with children in urban school systems. In the face of increasing numbers and changing emphases of federally supported education improvement programs, many colleges and universities adopted a coping strategy of keeping the special projects on the periphery of institutional programs. The "special projects" were run by "temporary" faculty, employed on "soft money" lines. Thus, when the projects ended, the temporary faculty left, and little impact of the project remained (Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark & Nash, 1976).

The DGP differed in one very important respect. Implicit in this program was the aim of assisting teacher preparation programs to renew themselves, to develop programs consistent with the central purposes of the institution, and to renew and extend their own range of competencies--in short, to engage in the process of implementing change.

Background of PL 94-142

The development of public policies affecting handicapped children over the past two decades has been dramatic and far-reaching. What began as an advocacy movement by parents and a few concerned educators grew into a major federal policy with profound political, economic, and educational implications.

Prior to the early 1960s, handicapped children were educated in special self-contained classrooms or programs, often in special schools, residential centers, or institutions. Even the mildly handicapped children who were receiving their education in the public schools were generally in self-contained classrooms which, for the most part, were located in some separate or isolated part of the building. There was little interaction, or even contact, with children in regular classes. Most educators, including those who were concerned with the problems of retarded children, considered this arrangement to be the best for the students and for the school system (Watson, 1977).

The reaction against special classes for mildly handicapped children developed in the 1960s as more and more educators and social activists realized that "special classes did not seem to improve the skills and learning rates of those labeled retarded" (Watson, 1977, p. 35). A second realization was that children were often "being labeled as retarded or as having learning problems for reasons that were practical and social rather than educational" (Watson, 1977, p. 36).

Some social activists, seeing the exclusion of handicapped children from public education within the context of a larger civil rights issue, began to take their cases to the courts. At the same time, there was a growing activism on the part of parents. Parent groups were forming and serving in advocacy roles in support of their handicapped children. The parent groups, as well as concerned educators and social activists, were demanding equitable education and related services for all handicapped children. At about the same time, President Kennedy began to focus more public attention on the needs of the mentally retarded and established a White House Task Force on Mental Retardation. The Task Force issued sweeping recommendations for meeting the needs of the retarded through legislation and programs providing for education and training. With a growing public awareness and concern, stimulated by the president and his family, and an increasing awareness of the civil rights and equity issues, the advocacy movement for the handicapped grew.

Litigation and Legislation: Forerunners of PL 94-142

A series of court cases in the past decade, helped by the growing activism of parents and research from educators, has had a profound effect on the educational practices and legislation affecting handicapped children (Turnbull & Turnbull, 1978). The early court cases filed on behalf of handicapped children were based on the principles of the Brown v. Board of Education decision. The section that states "Such an opportunity [education], where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms" (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954, p. 193, in Bersoff & Veltman, 1979) served as the foundation for the landmark cases of Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. Pennsylvania (1972), and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia (1972). The cases argued that "handicapped children had the right to equal access to publicly funded education appropriate to their needs" (Bersoff & Veltman, 1979).

These cases established the right of mentally retarded children to have access to a free, public education appropriate to their needs. The court further found that mentally retarded children were capable of benefiting from a program of education and training. While the PARC case was focused on mentally retarded children, the Mills case extended the principles to all handicapped children. In the case of San Antonio School District v. Rodriguez (1973), the Supreme Court did not accept the argument that varying per capita expenditures among school districts was a denial of equal protection and thus a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

These court cases, while not totally consistent, did establish three principles: (1) the right of handicapped children to a public education; (2) the guarantee of due process; and (3) the principle that handicapped children could benefit from an education. In order to assure the "appropriate" aspects of education, the advocates saw that the courts would not be the avenue, but rather that the route was state and federal legislation.

Some of the earlier legislation which had addressed the needs of the handicapped included: Title VI, "Education of Handicapped Children," 1966; an amendment to the ESEA of 1965; "Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act," in 1968; and amendments to this act in 1970 and 1974 extending provisions of the Act as well as the federal role in providing financial assistance.

In 1975 Congress, by a wide margin, passed The Education For All Handicapped Children's Act, PL 94-142 which guaranteed educational equity to a large group of children. Bert Sharp, professor at the University of Florida, has called the law "perhaps the most significant educational policy since the civil rights policies affecting racial minorities" (National Support Systems Project, p. 15). Firmly embedded in this public policy is the clear articulation of the rights of handicapped children.

The Dean's Grant Program

Since 1957, the OSEP was empowered to develop programs to improve educational opportunities for children who had been classified as mentally retarded. In the 1960s and 1970s, the programs were expanded to include education of children with a variety of handicaps (Sharp, 1982). OSEP thus provided support for innovative programs for training of special educators, research, development of materials, and local delivery systems for improving educational opportunities of children and youth with mental retardation.

By the late 1960s and early 1970s, with increased concern from the educational community, a growing parent advocacy movement, and progressive legislation and judicial rulings, the OSEP program was expanded to cover educational opportunities for children with a full range of handicaps.

Even before passage of PL 94-142 and the landmark judicial rulings of PARC v. Pennsylvania (1972) and Mills v. Washington, D.C. (1972), handicapped children were guaranteed their rights to a free, appropriate, public education in the least restrictive environment. As the movement culminated in 1975 with passage of PL 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, the role of the schools in meeting the educational needs of all children was transformed (Sharp, 1982).

It was clear that the education of handicapped children was no longer the sole responsibility of special educators, but was a responsibility shared by regular classroom teachers, administrators, and other nonspecial educators.

Prior to 1974, the need to provide additional training for regular educators who were becoming involved in the education of handicapped children was addressed primarily through limited inservice activities. Recognizing the magnitude of the problems, statewide study commissions began to look at the comprehensive training needs and certification requirements (Behrens & Grosenick, 1978). The federal role had been a catalytic one directing limited support to specialized innovative projects.

The result of the statewide study commissions pointed to the need to make fundamental changes in the undergraduate and graduate programs preparing regular educators--teachers, administrators, counselors, and other educational support personnel. During the spring of 1974, as staff of the OSEP were considering future priorities for their program, they began to hold discussions with professionals and representatives of teacher education programs, state agencies, local schools, and advocacy groups. At about the same time, the professional teacher education community began to

> realize that a change in the preparation of teachers was essential if educators were to meet the challenge of the 1980s and, at the same time, to maintain their professional status. (Behrens & Grosenick, 1978, p. 1)

It became clear that if handicapped children were to be accorded their full rights to a free, appropriate public education, there would need to be fundamental changes in the preparation of teachers.

The Dean's Grant Program was initiated and announced in a "Dear Colleague" letter to deans of education from Edwin Martin, then Deputy Commissioner of Education. This "Dear Colleague" announcement of July 1974 serves as the sole official agency communication to the field. It provided the only definition of the Dean's Grant concept and delineation of program requirements. Unlike other federal programs, the announcement was not accompanied by lengthy and detailed regulations (Hagerty, Personal Communication, 1982).

The purpose of the DGP was to encourage and assist SCDE to reconceptualize teacher preparation programs, to extend the context and content of regular education, to reform training sequences and curricula to prepare all graduates with competencies for serving a population of children with a wider range of individual abilities, needs, and differences, to provide effective education for all children including those with handicapping conditions. Deans of education were invited to submit proposals for projects that would investigate alternative approaches and solutions to the various problems involved in teacher preparation programs.

The DGP, initiated at the federal level to stimulate reshaping teacher preparation to include the learning needs of handicapped children as an integral part, recognized that enduring change cannot be imposed from external sources, but must come from within. The objectives, activities, and impact of a program would have to be defined by those at participating institutions, based on their perceptions of their institutional needs, and their perceptions of innovations that would effect changes in their curricula (Behrens, 1975). The Dean's Grant Program was designed with a minimum of prescriptions and requirements for local institutions. Although the grants were relatively small, the local institution was allowed considerable discretion in using the funds to motivate faculty involvement in curriculum revision.

Requirements of Dean's Grants

While the requirements and prescriptions were minimal, there were three expectations outlined for proposed projects:

1. The dean or head of teacher education must serve as the Project Director on the premise that, in order to bring about change, it was necessary to have the overt support of someone with status, authority, and decision-making capability.

2. The plan for revising teacher preparation programs in terms of responsiveness to the educational needs of handicapped children would extend "beyond the addition of one or two courses to include significant practica experiences" (Clair et al., 1979, p. 75). The plan was to be innovative, but also responsive to state and local training needs.

3. There must be evidence of strong, but not exclusive, involvement of the special education faculty. The significant value of the knowledge and skills of special education faculty was recognized; it was also recognized that in order to achieve comprehensive impact in all areas, other faculty must be involved on an equal basis (Behrens & Grosenick, 1978).

The first deans' grants were awarded for the 1975-76 academic year. Thirty-nine projects were funded, with an average grant of $35,000 per year for three years.

Table 2.1 shows the support provided for deans' grants from 1975 to 1983.

In the first nine years of the DGP, approximately 275 colleges and universities, which prepare more than 50% of the nation's teachers, have had dean's grant projects ranging from one to nine years.

Table 2.1*

Dean's Grant Projects Awarded 1975-1984

Year	Projects	Total Level of Funding
1975-76	39	$1,400,000
1976-77	60	3,230,000
1977-78	75	3,230,000
1976-79	92	3,420,000
1979-80	117	6,486,000
1980-81	141	7,250,000
1981-82	132	6,187,000
1982-83	105	5,700,000
1983-84	90	4,800,000

National Technical Assistance

From the inception of the DGP, the OSEP established a national technical assistance project to "manage and conduct technical assistance services for all projects" (Sharp, 1983, p. 7). The technical assistance project operated in collaboration with, but separately from, OSEP to separate the latter's responsibility for monitoring projects from the advocacy role of a technical assistance project.

The national technical assistance project which grew out of the EPDA-supported Leadership Development Institute/Special Education at the University of Minnesota, became the National Support Systems Project (NSSP) under the direction of Maynard C. Reynolds. Under Reynolds' leadership, the role of NSSP was twofold: (1) to provide a variety of support services to individual projects through consultation, training, dissemination of information, advocacy, and engaging the projects in a national network; and (2) to maintain liaison and coordination with the OSEP, while recognizing the agency's responsibility for complying with legislative mandates and performing a monitoring role--in essence, separating the technical assistance/support services from the monitoring/evaluation functions. Thus, Reynolds saw the need for such a technical assistance project as being able to serve both agency and local dean's grant projects "without violating the trust of either" (Sharp, 1982, p. 7).

---

*Hagerty et al., 1982, p. 19.

In order to serve the projects more effectively, the country was divided into regions (from five to eight regions depending on the number of projects), with a dean of one of the projects serving as the liaison dean, providing services on a more immediate basis for projects within that region, and maintaining liaison with the NSSP staff. The regional liaison deans, along with a representative of advocacy groups and a handicapped person, comprised an Advisory Board to advise and assist the NSSP staff in serving both clients--the government agency and the individual projects. The Advisory Board also assisted the small central staff of the NSSP in organizing regional and national conferences for the individual projects, in facilitating communication among projects, and in identifying and addressing current problems and future trends in education of the handicapped.

One other aspect of the NSSP was that it was seen as a temporary organization with a specific purpose and role, not in competition with permanent professional organizations. In fact, NSSP ceased operations on September 30, 1982 after a little more than seven years' operation in providing technical assistance and support services to more than 260 projects.

Policy Context

In order to obtain a better understanding of the policy context and intent of the DGP as well as the perceptions of the implementers of the program, interviews were held with two program officers at the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, and with five members of the Advisory Board of the NSSP, all key leaders who had been involved with the DGP from its inception.

The interviews, which averaged approximately 45 minutes, were unstructured but were guided by the following purposes:

1. To develop a greater understanding of the Dean's Grant Program as designed at the federal level, its distinguishing features, and how it might be similar to or different from other federally sponsored programs;

2. To develop a better understanding of what was intended by the Dean's Grant Program and the kinds of changes which were anticipated; and

3. To identify factors or variables which might be critical in the implementation of a dean's grant project on the local level.

Responses to items (1) and (2) are discussed below. Information obtained from responses to item (3) was used to develop the conceptual framework for data collection on the selected sites and will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

Distinguishing characteristics of the Dean's Grant Program. In initiating the DGP, OSEP staff anticipated passage of PL 94-142, a major public policy that would profoundly affect the education of nonhandicapped as well as handicapped children, and recognized the extent of changes in preparation of the education personnel that would be needed.

Some characteristics which distinguish the DGP include:

1. Role of OSEP

   Staff of the OSEP were willing to support a developmental effort where the shape and form of the program and the specific outcomes would evolve from the field, rather than be specified in advance by program requirements.

   OSEP staff took risks in supporting the program since the special education community was critical of the fact that money was being diverted from training special educators and given to regular educators.

   Within the OSEP, one staff member served as project officer, thus becoming an internal advocate for the program.

2. Preparation for policy implementation

   The program was designed to prepare for implementation of a major public policy and was based on a broad major goal--to reconceptualize regular teacher education--but did not include a preconceived master plan of what the changes or program outcomes should be.

   The program announcement, which included a minimum of requirements and regulations, was sufficiently ambiguous to allow for a wide range of activities and approaches on the local level.

3. Institutional development focus of the grant program

   The program provided the opportunity for the individual institution to make very broad organizational changes or very narrow curriculum changes, depending on the interest and needs at the local level.

The program aimed at affecting institutional development, providing the mechanism for infusing the system with the knowledge and skills for reconceptualizing the teacher education programs.

The grants were given to the dean as someone with a broad span of responsibility to link with other kinds of activities, and someone who could cross departmental barriers.

The grants, while small (averaging $35,000-40,000 per year) gave the dean considerable flexibility and discretion in using the funds to involve faculty in the curriculum revision process.

4. National technical assistance

A national technical assistance/support system was set up at the same time as the DGP was initiated (NSSP).

The NSSP provided technical assistance to local projects as needed.

The NSSP established a regionally based national networking system, encouraging communication and cooperation among projects.

The NSSP provided an opportunity for deans and leaders in teacher education to come together around common issues.

The NSSP was set up as a temporary support system so as not to compete with individual projects or established professional organizations.

The NSSP was given considerable freedom and flexibility to work with the other organizations (e.g., AACTE, NCATE) and to respond to emergent needs and issues.

Purpose and intentions of the Dean's Grant Program. The initiation of the DGP in 1974 anticipated passage of PL 94-142 (1975), and recognized the extent of changes in preparation of educational personnel that would be needed to accord handicapped children their right to a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. Edwin Martin, formerly Deputy Assistant Secretary of

Education, expressed concern about the dichotomy between regular and special education and the need to renegotiate new relationships between regular educators and special educators.

The DGP was designed around the broad general concept that regular educators needed to know more about educating handicapped children in regular settings, and that SCDE would need to revise their preparation programs in order to equip their graduates with the competencies for educating handicapped children in regular settings. While it was clear that changes in teacher preparation programs were needed, there were no preconceived views of what the changes should be.

The DGP was based on the underlying assumptions that (1) if change were to occur at all, it would be necessary to have the dean directing the change efforts; and (2) in order for change to be enduring, it cannot be imposed from external sources but must be designed internally in response to specific institutional needs. Thus, support was provided for a wide range of activities and approaches designed to achieve the broad goal of improving regular education preparation programs to incorporate the educational needs of handicapped children.

The DGP was seen as a developmental activity in personnel preparation, providing support to strengthen institutions, but allowing the institutions to define what strengthening activities were needed. Unlike other personnel programs, the desired outcomes were not defined in terms of numbers of students trained, but rather focused on broader changes in social policy dealing with changing human values and attitudes. Changing the values, attitudes, and knowledge of prospective regular educators meant changing the values, attitudes, and knowledge of the faculty preparing these prospective regular educators. Thus, the DGP supported professional development activities for the faculty.

Initially, the DGP was very broad and ambiguous as to what was expected. In the first round of grants, there was considerable confusion among project staff at the OSEP, the proposal review panels, and the applicants themselves. The program goals were broad: there was no specific structure on which to evaluate proposals and no clear models on which to base comparisons.

At the first meeting of grantees--those deans and project coordinators whose proposals had been successful--the confusion and ambiguity were apparent. In making the grants to deans, there was the

> assumption that the deans would do it, but it was not clear what it was they were to do....No one really knew what a Dean's Grant was supposed to do, except they were given money to bring about change. (Key leader in DGP)

Summary

The DGP was designed to assist SCDE to incorporate education of the handicapped as an integral part of teacher preparation programs, but what those changes should be or what approaches were to be used to achieve those changes were not specified. Thus, the grants provided small amounts of money, large amounts of flexibility and discretion in achieving a broad goal, and the expectation that the dean would serve as the leader in the change process.

The present study examined the implementation of dean's grant projects in eleven sites in order to learn more about what actually happens when an academic change project is implemented in higher education, what kinds of changes were achieved, and what strategies, practices, and processes affected the change effort.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Approach and Rationale

The general purpose of this study is to increase understanding of the implementation of change in higher education and to help explain the processes for effectively managing change. In order to learn more about what actually happens when a change project is introduced into a college or university, qualitative research methodology was selected. The case-study approach was utilized as a way to deal with a wide range of institutional factors, characteristics, and processes in order to achieve a comprehensive, indepth exploration and holistic analysis of a complex problem: implementation of academic change in complex organizations--academic institutions.

In qualitative/naturalistic inquiry approaches, knowledge and understanding are developed essentially through inductive processes. Naturalistic inquiry, which is compared to and builds on the Glaser and Strauss (1967) grounded theory approach, is a "discovery-oriented" approach which minimizes control and manipulation of variables and places no preconceived notions on what the outcomes might be (Guba, 1978; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Patton, 1980). One begins

> not with models, hypotheses, or theorems, but rather with the understanding of frequently minute episodes and interactions that are examined for broader patterns and processes. (Rist, 1977, p. 44)

Theory is extrapolated from grounded events, that is, experiences shared and understood by the participants and the researcher. The researcher, in this instance, begins with the perceptions and understanding of the events in question, and then seeks to articulate broader patterns and processes that are applicable to other individuals and groups in other circumstances and settings.

A concept in the social sciences that is central to qualitative methodology is Weber's principle of verstehen, the understanding of human behavior from the actor's own frame of reference. The naturalistic investigator is concerned with describing and understanding social phenomena in a naturally occurring environment. Guba and Lincoln (1981) say that

> Naturalistic inquiries focus on multiple realities that, like the layers of an onion, nest within or complement one another. Each layer provides a different perspective of reality, and none can be considered more "true" than any other. Phenomena do not converge into a form, a simple "truth," but diverge into many forms, multiple "truths." Moreover, the layers cannot be described or understood in terms of separate independent and dependent variables; rather they are interrelated to form a pattern of "truth." It is these patterns that must be searched out, less for the sake of prediction and control than for the sake of verstehen or understanding. (p. 57)

Qualitative methodology, which draws from sociological and anthropological field studies and ethnography, includes strategies such as participant observation, indepth interviewing, or total participation in the activity being studied and "allows the researcher to obtain firsthand knowledge about the empirical social world in question--to get close to the data" (Filstead, 1970, p. 6). These methodologies assume there is value to an analysis of both the inner experience and outer behavior of a subject as viewed by both the researcher and the participant (Rist, 1979).

The qualitative researcher tends toward holistic analysis, as opposed to component analysis of the problem. The holistic analysis approach assumes that reality cannot be broken down into component parts without the risk of distortion.

> Focusing on a narrow set of variables necessarily sets up a filtering screen between the researcher and phenomena he is attempting to comprehend...[and] inhibits the observer from a necessary closeness to the data, from an understanding of what is unique as well as what is generalizable from the data, and from perceiving the processes involved in contrast to simply the outcomes. (Rist, 1977, p. 47)

In conducting qualitative research, Rist (1977) suggests that validity can be achieved through "personalized" intimate understanding of the social phenomena, stressing "'close in' observations to achieve factual, reliable, and confirmable data" (p. 46).

One method of qualitative research or naturalistic inquiry is the case study, a comprehensive, indepth exploration of a problem. According to Stake (1978):

> The case need not be a person or enterprise. It can be whatever "bounded system" [to use Louis Smith's term] is of interest. An institution, a program, a responsibility, a collection, or a population can be the case. (p. 7)

Case studies involve data collection from multiple sources, at least some of which are in the natural setting; consideration of many variables which are often interacting; and descriptions which are complex, holistic, and rich with information. Case studies provide a basis for naturalistic generalization (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Stake, 1978).

Thus, the case-study approach was utilized for the present study. Case-study research offered the opportunity to gather data in a natural setting, and allowed for the indepth exploration of a set of complex variables and their interactions. Many different techniques--interviews, consultations, document study, and onsite observations--were applied to the same situation to obtain multiple perceptions for purposes of cross-validation of qualitative data. The onsite data collection also enhanced the potential for ferreting out those subtle and all-too-often elusive institutional factors and interaction patterns critical to the functioning of an organization. Understanding the informal as well as the formal power and authority structures, and the dynamic processes and their interactions is necessary to comprehending the process of implementing change in higher education. Further, the comprehensiveness and onsite nature of case-study methodology provided a "reality" context in which to analyze and evaluate the data.

Sample

A sample of eleven projects of the 105 dean's grant projects in operation during the 1982-83 academic year were selected for onsite study. Stratified random sampling procedures were used to identify sites, with alternate sites identified to assure maximum variation, as recommended for naturalistic inquiry research (Guba, 1982; Patton, 1980).

Two criteria were used in the sampling procedure--size of institution, and number of years of DGP funding. Use of these two criteria was based on two previous studies related to dean's grants. Okun (1981), in her study of deans' perceptions of their ability to influence change through DGPs, found institutional size inversely related to perceived faculty involvement in academic innovation. Baldwin et al. (1981) and NSSP (1980) reported that the range and scope of changes in curriculum and faculty development activities progressed along a continuum related to years of funding.

Table 3.1 presents the matrix for sample selection.

Table 3.1

Sample Selection: Projects in Operation, 1982-83

Total Enrollment	1-2 Years of Project		3-4-5 Years of Project		6-7-8-9 Years of Project		Total	
	N	Sample	N	Sample	N	Sample	N	Sample
5,000 or fewer	7	1	15	1	---		22	2
5,000-20,000	15	1	37	4	9	1	61	6
more than 20,000	---		12	2	7	1	19	3
Total	22	2	64	7	16	2	102*	11*

*Projects not included in total N: two projects to professional associations; one project which was an "outreach" project and not in the School of Education; there was also a second project in that university.

The institutions selected for study included seven public and four independent institutions. Geographically, the institutions were spread from coast to coast, with sites in the Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, Southwest, Mountain States, and the West Coast.

Data Collection Methods

Once the sites were identified, telephone contact was made with the deans to invite their participation. The purposes of the study and the research design were described. When the dean agreed to participate, a letter was sent confirming the phone conversation. An abstract of the study was included with the letter. The researcher also requested that copies of the Dean's Grant proposals, progress reports, other related materials, a college/university catalogue, and other descriptive materials of the institution be returned for review prior to the site visit.

Site visits to the eleven institutions were conducted between October 1982 and March 1983. Interviews were scheduled with the dean, the project coordinator(s), and selected participants of targeted faculties.

The interviews were approximately one hour in length, with longer and more intensive interviews with deans and project coordinators. The interviews were unstructured, but were guided with a focus on four major areas: (1) leadership and management of the project; (2) faculty development; (3) curriculum revision; and (4) culture and context. These areas provide the thematic focus for the presentation of findings and discussion in subsequent chapters. Table 3.2 provides a profile of sites and number of persons interviewed.

Data Analysis

Data were obtained from multiple sources, including document study, telephone interviews, consultation with key figures in the DGP, and intensive interviews with project leadership, participant faculty, and targeted faculty. The number of onsite interviews varied with size of institution and number of faculty actively involved in the project.

Information obtained from the raw data was analyzed along a process of data reduction, categorization, and content analysis. Data were first analyzed and categorized in the major thematic areas. Content analysis of the within-site data led to the next level of data reduction--synthesis and summarization. At this level, data were compared and analyzed cross-site. Data analysis and interpretation at each level were confirmed by an expert-consultant.

Authenticity of the Study

In qualitative research, one means of verifying data and providing credibility to the study is referred to as "triangulation" (Guba, 1982; Rist, 1977, 1982). In triangulation, data are obtained from multiple sources and cross checked for confirmability. In the present study, data were obtained from multiple sources--documents as well as multiple interviews at each site to obtain multiple perceptions on the

Table 3.2

Profile of Sample Sites and Interviewees

Institution	Public	Private	Approximate Enrollment		Highest Degree	Educ. Faculty	Interviewed				Year of Project
			Total	Educ.			Dean	Spec. Ed. Fac.	Reg. Ed. Fac.	Coord.	
#1		X	3000	379	M.A.	46	1			1	2
#2		X	3900	300	M.S.	[illegible]	1		3	1	4
#3	X		10K	1500	Ph.D.	66	1	2	3	1	2
#4	X		18K	1000	M.S.	68	1	1	2	2	3
#5	X		14K	N/A	M.A.	N/A	1	1	2	1	3
#6		X	11K	250	Ph.D.	52	1	2	3	1	3
#7		X	6K	450	Ph.D.	36	1	1	2	1	3
#8	X		18K	360	Ph.D.	81	1		3	1	8
#9	X		37K	3000	Ph.D.	150	1	2	1	1	3
#10	X		20K	550	Ph.D.	40	1	1	1	2	4
#11	X		23.5K	2200 1000	Ph.D.	175	1	1	4	2	8

same issues--providing the opportunity for confirmability of the data. The data were analyzed qualitatively across sites, along the major thematic areas identified earlier. Verification of the data analysis was provided by working closely with a consultant, an expert in educational research as well as the DGP.

Confidentiality

The anonymity of participating institutions and faculty was assured. In reporting the result of the study, descriptions of sites, project personnel, or project activities are masked to protect the privacy of participants.

Participant faculty were assured that any information, opinions, and attitudes expressed by them would be treated confidentially and not released to anyone else within the site or external to the institution.

Before beginning an interview, the researcher obtained permission to record the interview. Only one interviewee refused permission but allowed the researcher to take notes during the interview. These raw data are available only to the researcher.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS: DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

Implementation of public policies provides some of the most powerful forces for change in educational organizations. The demands of public policy often require academic innovation and programmatic changes to meet the interests and needs of new student populations. This study examined the implementation of the Dean's Grant Program (DGP), as one example of policy implementation affecting academic innovation in higher education.

Zaltman, Duncan and Holbek (1973), in discussing social change and the process of change in organizations, define innovation as "any idea, practice, or product that is perceived as new by the potential unit of adoption" (p. 10). They draw distinctions in the levels of the social system, defining the megasystem as the "social milieu within which the organizations exist" (p. 2). When an innovation has been adopted by a sufficient number of relevant units (i.e., colleges and universities) with the system (i.e., teacher preparation) to register an impact, to become part of the normative patterns of the megasystem, social change has occurred. In a sense, then, the DGP was a direct effort to stimulate social change, to serve as a catalytic agent to generate change within a sufficient number of relevant units to have an impact on the system, creating new norms for the preparation of teachers.

Although each DGP had features and characteristics unique to its own setting, all shared a common goal: to prepare regular educators to function in settings into which handicapped children had been mainstreamed. To attain this goal, most projects had objectives related to (1) faculty development with an emphasis on faculty attitudes and increased awareness and knowledge of the education of handicapped children and youth, and (2) curriculum revision and implementation to include concepts and content for education of handicapped children and youth.

In a state-of-the-art study of the DGP, Baldwin et al. (1982) examined the stated objectives and self-reported progress of projects in operation in 1980-81 (of 141 projects in operation, 122 submitted proposals for review). Of the 122 projects, 102 (84%) had objectives related to faculty awareness and attitudes, and 84 (69%) had objectives related to curriculum change. To a lesser degree, other objectives focused on administrative changes, materials development, and changes in student competencies.

This study of the implementation of the DGP examined the extent of change effected in the two central program areas on which there was such overwhelming emphasis--faculty development and curriculum revision--and the implementation processes used to achieve the desired changes.

The research was guided by four broad questions:

1. To what extent were curricular changes--including changes in course requirements, course content, and practica--effected as a result of the dean's grant project.

2. To what extent were faculty assisted in the development of new attitudes, knowledge, and skills and engaged in revising curriculum to achieve the desired changes?

3. What were the types and effectiveness of the practices and strategies used in the initiation, implementation, and management of the project?

4. How did the organizational characteristics, processes, and culture affect the effectiveness of the project?

The findings are presented in four thematic domains:

1. Leadership and management: including a focus on the rationale and motivation for applying; the key leadership and key actors in initiating and managing the project; perceived identity and ownership of the project; and involvement of the faculty in the early stages.

2. Faculty development: including scope and target of faculty development; objectives; strategies and activities; and outcomes.

3. Curriculum revision: including scope and focus; objectives; strategies and activities; and outcomes.

4. Culture and context: including discussion of institutional characteristics and features; perceived mission and priorities; and incentive and reward systems.

In the presentation of findings, the eleven sites which were studied are referred to by number. The matrix below (Table 4.1) also identifies the institutions by size and number of years of project. These project identification numbers are used consistently throughout the study.

The sites included in the study reflect a wide variation of institutions and settings. The sample included seven public and four independent institutions, with student populations ranging from 3,000 to more than 23,000. The institutions were located in geographically diverse urban, suburban, and rural settings, and were spread across the country from the coast to the coast. The range and scope of the study are reflected in the following brief descriptions of the sites.

Table 4.1

Matrix of Projects

Total	Years of Dean's Grant Project*		
Enrollment*	1-2 Years	3-4-5 Years	6 Years or More
less than 5,000	Project #1	Project #2	---
5,000 to 20,000	Project #3	Project #4 5 6 7	Project #8
more than 20,000	---	Project #9	Project #11

*Institutional size, as indicated by total student enrollment, and years of dean's grant project were the two criteria used in selecting the sample of sites. The reader is referred to page 61 for the matrix used in sample selection. The reader is also referred to Table 3.2, page 65 for profiles on each site.

The Sites: Brief Descriptions

Profile: Site #1

Located in the southeastern part of the country, Site #1 is a small, prestigious, well-endowed college, rich in history and traditions. Comprised of five undergraduate schools and a graduate division, the college offered the bachelor's and master's degrees. In spite of high tuition, the university had maintained its desired level of enrollment. The university was undergoing some reorganization and there had been some change in the top administration, but overall was in "very solid" condition.

The school of education, however, was "shaky." It had suffered a dramatic drop in enrollment and, within a three-year period, had gone from being the largest to the smallest school within the college. Its status was in jeopardy--if the enrollment dropped further, the school could be downgraded to a division. There were 46 faculty members in the school of education, including 14 in the college's laboratory school. Approximately 50% were tenured, although university guidelines set 40% as a quota. The dean had just been charged with preparing a contingency retrenchment plan. Survival issues seemed to be paramount, as reflected by the dean's comment: "We had to change so many things just for survival."

The DGP was in its second year of operation. The college had had a one-year planning grant, with a one-year hiatus between the planning year and the current operational grant.

Profile: Site #2

This small, well-endowed university, founded by a religious group, was located on a beautiful and spacious campus on the outskirts of a small city in the south. The university, which enjoyed a fine academic reputation and strong liberal arts tradition, offered the bachelor's and master's degrees, and a master's-plus-30- credits certificate. Even with high tuition, the university had no problem maintaining a stable enrollment or the selectiveness of its student body.

Over the past several years, the university had had several faculty development grants, creating a climate in which faculty development was seen as normal and an important part of university life. Those projects were supported mainly by foundation grants.

The teacher preparation programs were offered through the education department, a small unit in the college of arts and sciences. In the past, the university had not had many federally funded projects, and the education department probably had had none. In recent years, the education department had several special education projects. There was some feeling on the part of the faculty that the special education unit was growing too fast--"too much money, too much emphasis ...puts special education out of proportion with the rest of the department." These fears seemed to be somewhat allayed by the faculty's respect and good feelings for the Dean's Grant project coordinator.

The dean's grant project was in its fourth year.

Profile: Site #3

Site #3 was a state university located in the south central part of the country. Begun in the early 1900s as a two-year institution preparing teachers for the public schools, the university was comprised of eight schools/colleges and an external services division, and offered degrees through the doctorate. The school of education had about 60 faculty members, including 22 from the campus school.

This university had undergone major changes in the past few years. The president and most other top administrators, including the dean of education, were new in their positions. The university had also been through major reorganization and had converted, over faculty objections, from a quarter to a semester system.

There appeared to be strong political undercurrent on the campus. As one faculty member described it: "We had two presidential assassinations in the past four years." They had gone from a long-time, autocratic president to an innovative one who valued change for change's sake, to the current one, who was seen as "moderate." The faculty had an "inherent distrust of the administration," and were "very angry and resistant to all the changes which they saw thrust upon them," and thus adopted a "survivalist attitude." Faculty morale was described as "somewhat below zero."

The dean's grant project was in its second year.

Profile: Site #4

This college, part of a large public university system, was one of the first four-year, publicly supported, liberal arts institutions in its large northeastern, metropolitan area. It had the reputation of being an academically prestigious public institution with a strong liberal arts tradition. Some of the faculty in the school of education felt that "education [was] a stepchild" in this environment. The college as a whole had recently suffered enrollment decline and budgetary problems. Some faculty in the school of education felt that it had to absorb more than its share of cutbacks.

The school of education, with a faculty of approximately 68, offered programs leading to the bachelor's and master's degrees. All faculty were tenured; the others had been retrenched.

The dean's grant project was in its third year of operation.

Profile: Site #5

This university, located on the west coast, was part of a large state university system. Comprised of six professional/technical schools, a graduate studies division, and teacher preparation center that provided educational credentialing, it offered the bachelor's and master's degrees. It prepared its students for a wide range of technical and professional careers. The dean's grant project in this site was unique in its multidisciplinary focus, which cut across six schools and 25 departments. Although the university had a teacher preparation center that provided credentialing for the other programs, it was not included in the DGP.

Approximately 65% of the faculty are tenured. Although the faculty were not very much involved in grants or special projects, they were described as being open to change, but were more likely to respond than to initiate. Most faculty members maintained involvement with their own professions beyond the university and, while they might cooperate with new programs, they were not likely to take the time to initiate them.

The dean's grant project was in its third year of operation.

Profile: Site #6

Site #6 was a private, nonsectarian university located in a northeastern suburban community. The university was comprised of five colleges, including the college of education and one professional school. The university offered the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees.

Within the previous ten years, the university suffered severe economic problems and had been on the verge of closing. The university continued, but with severe budgetary constraints and the retrenchment of large numbers of faculty. Within a few years, the college of education faculty was reduced by 50%, and at the time of this study had approximately 50 faculty members, of whom about 80% were tenured.

The faculty in the school of education were "entrepreneurial" and had had many grants and special projects. Faculty were described as "open to change," but more likely to be reactive than proactive in initiating projects and programs. The school, which had a tradition of strong, autonomous departments, was in the midst of reorganization, combining some departments so that there were now five instead of eight.

The dean's grant project was in its third year.

Profile: Site #7

This west coast university, founded by a religious group, was one of the first institutions to be chartered in its state. Comprised of two liberal arts colleges, seven professional schools, and a graduate school, the university offered degrees through the doctorate. It served a student population that came from all parts of the United States, as well as several foreign countries and, in spite of high tuition, had no problem maintaining enrollment at its desired level. The school of education, a relatively small school within the university, was also "holding its own" on enrollment.

The school of education had had a number of academic innovation projects, and have in fact received awards of excellence for some of their programs. The faculty were accustomed to participating in special projects.

The dean's grant project was in its third year of operation.

Profile: Site #8

Founded as a land grant college in the 1890s, Site #8 is the major campus of this state university system in the northeast. The school of education is one of 17 schools and colleges spread out on several different campuses. The school of education had approximately 80 faculty members and offered programs leading to the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. Part-time students comprised a large proportion of the student body.

In recent years, the school of education experienced a decreasing enrollment, combined with increasing pressure from the state legislature to redefine or reiterate its purposes and mission. Faced with survival issues, the school reiterated its commitment to serve public education and began reorganization of the school to make more efficient use of faculty.

The school of education had strong departments with considerable power within the departments. There were turf issues among departments, especially between regular and special education. Each thought it was doing a better job in preparing teachers than the other and, with declining enrollments, student credit hours--who taught what to whom--was of major importance.

The dean's grant project was in its eighth year of operation.

Profile: Site #9

Established as a normal school, Site #9 was a large state university located in a metropolitan area in the southwest. The college of education, one of nine colleges that comprise the university, offered bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. There were approximately 150 faculty members in the college of education.

This major state university was described as being in transition from a "regional, teaching, service" institution to a "large, national, teaching, scholarship" institution. In this transition, emphasis was being placed on the scholarship, meaning experimental research and publication in refereed journals. The goal was to become a top-level research institution with a national reputation.

The school of education was in the process of reorganization. There had been a tradition of strong departmental autonomy but with factions within departments. The reorganization seemed to be directed toward breaking down departmental barriers and encouraging faculty to work together in the development of a generic model of teacher preparation.

The faculty were resistant to change and wanted "independence" in their professional work. But over the previous few years, enrollment had declined and the state had decreased the university's budget. As the hard times hit, grant money began to look more attractive and faculty began to be more receptive to change programs.

The dean's grant project was in its third year.

Profile: Site #10

Site #10, located in the Mountain States, was the flagship campus of a major state university system with several campuses and centers. The school of education was one of 16 schools and colleges in the university. Located on the main campus, the school of education had approximately 40 faculty members, and offered bachelor's, master's, specialist, and doctoral degrees.

The school of education had just been through massive organizational and curricular changes. One of the branch campuses had split off and most programs in education had been restructured under the auspices of two major, externally funded projects. There were strong autonomous departments which resisted the change, causing considerable conflict within and between departments. In general, faculty morale was described as very low.

In addition, a few years before, the state legislature eliminated the school of education from the state budget. The school was rescued but suffered massive budget cuts. As a result, a maximum was set for the number of students enrolled in the education programs, and the maximum number of credits in the professional sequence was reduced from 45 to 32.

Historically, the faculty at this university had been suspicious of federally mandated programs and were not sure that the federal agenda was in the best interest of the state. Until recent years, no federal grants had been accepted.

The dean's grant project was in the fourth year of a second cycle.

Profile: Site #11

Site #11 was a large state university located in a rural area in the midwest, and was comprised of eight colleges and schools, including the school of education. The school, which was the largest SCDE included in the study, had a faculty of approximately 175 and offered bachelor's, master's, specialist, and doctoral degrees. It was the largest producer of teachers for the state's public schools.

The university had undergone major administrative changes in the past few years. Most of the top administration, including vice presidents and deans, were relatively new in their positions. In contrast, the dean of the school of education had been in that position for many years. The university had suffered budget reductions and there had been no faculty salary increases except merit increases in the past two years. The extensive changes "caused fixed positions which are resistant to anything that comes from the top down."

When the state legislature had attempted to eliminate the school of education a few years before, the faculty saw the potential crisis and responded with an attitude of, "Okay, if we have to make changes, let's do it before someone does it for us." The faculty got together and engaged in external activities to save the school while internally strengthening programs and improving the school's image. Change for survival was accepted and valued.

Discussion

Although the above sample of sites varied considerably in size and setting, most of them were experiencing enrollment declines with concomitant budget reductions. The economic problems were more severe at some sites than at others: some were in the midst of the most critical challenges to their existence, while others had survived the test and had moved on to reorganization and more efficient operation. Four of the institutions reported that they had almost closed due either to legislative action or to severe economic difficulties. Only two of the sites did not report having to deal with the problems of enrollment decline and budget reductions.

One theme that emerged was that when their existence was threatened, faculty became engrossed in survival issues and it was more difficult to engage them in program issues or innovation efforts. However, at one site which the legislature had proposed closing, the faculty responded by mounting a public effort to keep the school open, and by taking internal steps to improve programs "before someone else does it for us."

Another factor that seemed to run through several of the sites was the disquieting effect of reorganization. Seven sites reported major reorganization--either at the university or SCDE level. Again, the sites were at different points in the reorganization: some were in the midst of the process, while at others the new organizational patterns were freshly in place. Whatever the point in the process or whatever the rationale for reorganization, the faculty reaction seemed to be the same--anxiety and resistance. While intellectually the faculty might acknowledge the need for a more efficient operation, their reactions were more likely to be resistant than cooperative if their departmental identity, status, and sometimes existence were threatened.

In light of the overall declining enrollments and the attention to student credit hours, turf issues of "who teaches what to whom" gained in importance and faculty willingness to collaborate with others decreased.

Leadership and Management

The management of change has been discussed extensively in the literature. Some suggest that implementation is a political process and should focus on organizational factors (Baldridge, 1978, 1980; Baldridge & Burtram, 1975), others argue that change is made by individuals (Hall, 1978), while still others view implementation of change as involving individuals as well as organizational factors (Arends & Arends, 1978; Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Lindquist, 1978; Schein, 1972).

Recent studies have shifted the view of policy implementation from the classical model, which assumed a straight-line procedure of responding to directives from top to bottom, to one that takes into account the more complex set of elements and participants in the policy formation and implementation process. In this view, innovation does not occur in a linear sequential fashion, but rather involves a complex set of fluid and interactive relationships among the various groups and subgroups (Earle, 1980; Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980). This interactive, complex view of implementation provided the framework for exploring the leadership and management aspects of the implementation of the DGP.

Information was sought in the following categories:

Rationale and motivation for applying for a dean's grant;
Leadership in initiation of the project;
Leadership and management of the project;
Perception of the dean's role;
Perception of "ownership" of the project;
Project coordinator's role within the institution.
Role of the faculty in the initial stages of the project.

Rationale and Motivation for Applying

Information was sought to determine the motivation and reasons for applying for the DGP. Interview questions directed toward this area included:

> How did you first hear about the Dean's Grant Program?
>
> What were your reactions to what you heard?
>
> What would you say were the primary reasons for applying for a dean's grant?
>
> Did you know about PL 94-142 before you heard about the Dean's Grant Program?
>
> Had there been any thought within the school of education given to the need to do something about PL 94-142 before the dean's grant?

This line of questioning was designed to elicit information on the primary purposes and goals in applying for a grant. At issue was whether there had been an identified need, and whether the need and purpose of the local proposals were consistent with the purposes of the DGP.

Recognition of a need or the motivation to change may be one of the first steps in the innovation process, leading to a search for alternative courses of action. Zaltman, Duncan and Holbek (1973) refer to this need as recognition of a performance gap--a discrepancy between the organization's current performance and the expectations of the social system and its environment. They point out, however, that the literature is not clear about whether recognition of a need precedes initiation of an innovation, or whether knowledge and awareness of an innovation is followed by identification of a need.

One assumption of the DGP was that in applying for a dean's grant a need had been identified by the institution. Since it is possible that the announcement of the DGP preceded the recognition of a need to change in many teacher education programs, data were sought to determine the primary reasons for an institution's applying for a dean's grant.

Questions regarding the rationale and motivation for applying for the grant were asked of all interviewees. However, responses to these questions came primarily from the dean, the project coordinator, and those faculty who might have been involved in developing the proposal. Faculty who joined the project at a later date or in some minor role were less able to respond directly to these questions.

Based on the responses, it was possible to identify four categories into which "Motivation" and "Rationale" could be grouped:

1. Performance gap: recognition of a discrepancy between the teacher education program and the competency needed by practitioners in the field, and the need to address the discrepancy.
2. Improve the education of handicapped children and youth.
    a. Strengthen the special education component of regular teacher education programs.
    b. Strengthen the special educator preparation program.
3. Organizational change: broad organizational change leading to the restructuring of departments or the total reform of the teacher education programs.
4. Economic: the need for external funds to address some internal problems.

The data presented in the following tables represent a synthesis of the responses from the various participants. Table 4.2 presents the primary rationale and motivation by institution. Table 4.3 presents a summary of the data.

Table 4.2

Rationale and Motivation for Applying

Project	Performance Gap	Improve Special Education	Organizational Change	Economic
#1		Wanted to extend lab school mainstreaming model to public schools.		Budget problems; needed grant.
#2		Saw it as way to strengthen special education unit for regular education. Also, way to build special education department.		
#3	Coordinator: "If I hadn't taken initiative, probably no one else would have."	Need to improve special education component of regular education.		
#4	Public schools putting pressure on college re preparation of teachers for mainstreamed setting.			Grant money available--make possible release of faculty to attend to issues re curriculum change.
#5		Wanted to improve education of handicapped across several disciplines. Wanted to get all faculty and students (university-wide) to better understand handicapped.		

Table 4.2 (cont.)

Project	Performance Gap	Improve Special Education	Organizational Change	Economic
#6	Public schools implement 94-142; look to college for help, "our faculty not equipped to help."		Opportunity to introduce change; respond to enrollment decline; reorganize department.	Entrepreneurial--actively sought grants.
#7		Opportunity to revitalize school of education; improve education for all kids, not only handicapped.		Outside funds available to do what had to do anyway.
#8	Growing concern regular education students not prepared for handicapped in LRE. Need to improve our work with students, especially re public education.			Could use money and recognition from having grant.
#9	Reaction from the field--graduates not doing the job.		Dean's goal--broad organizational change; new model for training educators.	

Table 4.2 (cont.)

Project	Performance Gap	Improve Special Education	Organizational Change	Economic
#10		Help prepare regular educators to manage mainstreamed classrooms. Coordinator interested in training regular educators as well as special educators.		Grant support special education component for regular education.
#11	Feedback from field--all educators--not only teachers--need to be prepared re PL 94-142.			Opportunity to get faculty tuned up. Grant money available, can use it.

Table 4.3

Summary: Rationale and Motivation for Applying

Rationale	Institution
Performance gap	#3, #4, #6, #8, #9, #11
Strengthen special ed. for regular ed.	#1, #2, #3, #5, #7, #10, #11
Strengthen special ed.	#2, #7, #10
Organizational change	#6, #9
Economic	#1, #4, #6, #7, #8, #10, #11

A review and synthesis of the multiple responses at each site found that, in general, the rationale in applying for a dean's grant had more than one purpose. The primary reasons of the eleven sites were mostly spread across the three categories: performance gap (6 sites); improve education of the handicapped (6 sites); and economic (7 sites). Only two sites indicated that broad organizational change was the purpose of seeking a dean's grant.

Although none of the respondents used the term "performance gap," each reported that there had been negative feedback from the field about their graduates' ability to function in mainstreamed classrooms. In some instances, state or local requirements for regular classroom teachers exacerbated the need for change in the teacher preparation programs.

At some sites, the DGP was seen simply as a means for revising the curriculum to strengthen the special education component of regular educators in response to the mandates of PL 94-142. The project objectives and activities were limited to this one purpose and did not attempt any broader impact.

At two sites, the dean saw the DGP as a way to initiate broad organizational change--to restructure departments or develop a totally new program for preparing regular educators. In both instances, curriculum revision was occurring concurrently with reorganization of the schools and redefinition of departmental boundaries.

The economic reasons--"Money was available and we needed it," or "We needed the prestige of getting a grant"--were reluctantly expressed. In general, the economic reasons emerged as a result of probing some of the other expressed reasons for seeking the grant. In most cases, the school was suffering from enrollment declines and budget constraints and saw external funds as one way of helping the financial problem while at the same time addressing the need to revise curriculum.

Leadership in Project Initiation

In this category, information was sought to determine the leadership in initiating application for a dean's grant. Questions were designed to determine whether the leadership or major push for the project came from the dean, the special education faculty, or the regular education faculty. Information was also sought to identify the key actors in this stage, and who was actively involved in developing and writing the proposal.

Some of the questions used to obtain information in this area included:

> Who were the key individuals involved in developing the dean's grant proposal?
>
> What roles did they play? e.g., consultant? proposal writer?
>
> Were you involved? What was your role?
>
> Why did you become involved (why not)?

Table 4.4 presents a summary of the key leadership involved in initiating the dean's grant proposal.

Table 4.4

Leadership in Project Initiation

Project	Initiator
#1	[1]* 3
#2	[2]
#3	[2] 3
#4	[1] 3
#5	[2] 1, 3
#6	[1] 3, 2
#7	[2] 1
#8	[1] 2, 3
#9	[1] 2, 3
#10	[2]
#11	[2] 1, 3

*[ ] indicates primary initiator, who then involved others.

1=Dean or Administration
2=Special Education Faculty
3=Regular Education Faculty

At all sites, the leadership for initiating a dean's grant project came from either the dean or the special education faculty. Even though the primary goal of the DGP was a revision of regular teacher preparation programs, in none of the sites visited did the regular education faculty initiate the dean's grant process. Even though regular education faculty did not initiate the project, at eight of the eleven sites, regular education faculty were brought into the process from the beginning and were involved in formulating the program and writing the proposal.

Leadership in Project Management

The focus here was to identify the leadership in managing the project after the grant was received. Questions were designed to find out who actually managed the project on a day-to-day basis, and whether project management rested with the dean, the special education department, or the regular education faculty. Since all projects had a project coordinator(s), questions were also directed toward learning how the project coordinator was selected, at what point in the process, and his or her role and status prior to the project. Of interest was whether the coordinator was from special education or regular education and whether he or she was a "senior," well-established faculty member or newly arrived on campus. The purpose of this line of questioning was to obtain a sense of the feelings of ownership of the project.

Table 4.5 identifies the key leadership in managing the project at each of the sites. Table 4.6 provides information on the role and status of the project coordinator.

Table 4.5

Leadership in Managing Project

Project	Role
#1	[3]* 1
#2	[2] 3
#3	[2]
#4	[3]
#5	[2]
#6	[3] 1
#7	[3] 1
#8	[3] 1
#9	[2] 3, 1
#10	[2]
#11	[2] [3] 1

*[ ] indicates primary leadership role.

1=Dean or Administration
2=Special Education Faculty
3=Regular Education Faculty

Leadership in project management. Although the dean was always listed as the project director, the day-to-day management was generally provided by the project coordinator. At none of the eleven sites was the dean identified as the primary manager. This is not to suggest that the deans were not involved, but rather that the responsibility for operating the project rested with faculty, usually in some cooperative way with the dean.

The role of regular education faculty, while minimal in project initiation, increased considerably when it came to project management.

Although the content of the changes proposed by dean's grant projects was special education, the target for those changes was the regular teacher education program. The initial grants announcement inviting proposals specified that regular education and special education faculty should be involved in the project. The most common pattern observed in this study was that the dean or special education faculty would initiate the process of applying for the grant, and then involve regular education faculty. The absence of regular education faculty in the initiation of dean's grant projects may be found in the means of communication regarding the program: generally information about the program from the Department of Education went either directly to the dean or to the dean through the special education faculty.

Project coordinators' role and status. Project coordinators were evenly divided between special educators and regular educators. Of the current coordinators, six were regular educators and six were special educators (one site had co-coordinators). Of the six regular educators, one was working on an advanced degree in special education.

Of the six sites with project coordinators from regular education departments, the coordinators were senior, well-established faculty members in five sites; in one site, the coordinator had not yet been granted tenure and could be considered "junior." It should be noted that one of the long-term projects (#11) began with a senior special education faculty member as coordinator, and then had senior regular education faculty as coordinators after the first three-year cycle.

Table 4.6

Project Coordinators' Role and Status

Project	Coordinator
#1	2A
#2	1B
#3	1C
#4	2A; 2A (co-coordinators)
#5	2D
#6	2A
#7	2A
#8	2A
#9	1B
#10	1C; 1C (co-coordinators)
#11	1A; 2A (different cycles of project

1=Special Education
2=Regular Education

A=Senior faculty member
B=Junior faculty member
C=Newly arrived on campus
D=Hired to run project

Five projects had special education faculty as coordinators. At two of those sites, the coordinators wrote the proposal almost immediately upon joining the faculty; at one site, the coordinator had been on the faculty two years before writing the proposal; in another site, the coordinator had been on the faculty for several years on a nontenured tract line, and was involved after the proposal was submitted; and at the other site, the coordinator was hired specifically to run the project.

The coordinator's role and status on the faculty seemed to be not as important as his/her leadership style and personality. At two sites, there were indications that the coordinator was somewhat abrasive, and thus the faculty were not eager to cooperate with his project. At other sites, faculty spoke in highly complimentary terms about the coordinator and indicated that his/her sensitive leadership was very important in the success of the project. A low-key, facilitator approach, which helped the faculty develop a sense that the project was their own, seemed to be the most successful.

Perception of the Dean's Role

One requirement for awarding a dean's grant was that the dean or head of teacher education serve as the project director on the premise that in order to bring about change, it was necessary to have the overt support of someone with status, authority, and decision-making capability.

Questioning in this area focused on the continuing involvement of the dean once the grant was received, and faculty perceptions of the dean's involvement. The questions were open-ended and, from the responses, three categories were defined to describe the levels of the dean's involvement in the project after the grant was received:

1. Directly and actively involved; provides leadership.
2. Involved but to a lesser extent; plays a facilitator role but leaves the management of the project to the project coordinator.
3. Minimal involvement; provides support and clout when requested; leaves management of the project to the coordinator and becomes involved only upon request or in a purely "social" way.

Responses of the interviewees are synthesized and presented in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7

Perceptions of Dean's Role

Project	Dean's Role
#1	1
#2	3
#3	2
#4	3
#5	3
#6	2
#7	1
#8	1
#9	2
#10	2
#11	1

1=Directly and actively involved, provided leadership
2=Involved, facilitator role
3=Minimal involvement, provided support, clout when requested

The level of the dean's continuing involvement in the project varied from project to project. Four of the projects reported that the dean had continued to be directly and actively involved in the project and had provided leadership. At three projects, the dean continued to be involved but played a supporting, facilitator role. At the other three sites, the dean was seen as minimally involved.

At the two projects where the dean was the chief academic officer in a multidisciplinary institution, the dean's involvement was perceived as minimal, providing support or assistance only when requested. At the other site where the dean's involvement was perceived as minimal, respondents indicated that he had too many other demands on his time and was very involved in activities beyond the college.

There was surprisingly little discrepancy between the dean's perception of his role and the coordinator's and faculty members' perceptions of his role. And in no case was there any indication that the dean was negative about the project or obstructed its progress. The dean was seen as supportive, even when the support was minimal or benign.

Perception of "Ownership" of the Project

The importance of implementers' feeling a sense of "ownership" of an innovation is a strong recurring theme in the literature. The chances of an innovation to be successful are enhanced when participants can shape the innovation and claim it for their own (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Elmore, 1978; Lindquist, 1978).

In the present study, the issue of faculty ownership of the Dean's Grant project was explored through questions related to perceived identity of the project (Table 4.8) and the role of the faculty in the initial stages of the project (Table 4.9).

Perceptions of project identity. At the majority of sites, the project was identified as the coordinator's project. At only one of these sites was the coordinator in special education; the others were in regular education. In some cases, the project was identified with more than one person, such as the dean and the coordinator, or the coordinator and the department, or the "perceived identity" shifted as the project progressed.

Table 4.8

Perceptions of Project Identity

Project	Perceived Identity
#1	1
#2	4
#3	2
#4	2
#5	1, & 3, then 1 & 2
#6	2
#7	1
#8	1 & 2
#9	4
#10	3
#11	3 & 2

1=Perceived as dean's project
2=Perceived as coordinator's project
3=Perceived as special education project
4=Perceived as SCDE project, or regular education "departmental" project

Table 4.9

Role of Faculty in Initial Stages
(Faculty, not deans, administrators, or department chairs)

Project	Faculty Role
1	3
2	1
3	2 (for a few); 3
4	3
5	3*
6	1
7	2
8	3
9	3
10	4
11	3

*Teacher preparation unit not involved, not interested, did not support the effort.

1=Involved in planning
2=Knew of application
3=Found out after funding approved
4=Little or none

At only two sites was the project identified as a regular education "departmental project." What is interesting is that in both of those projects, the coordinator was from special education. At one of those sites, each respondent quickly said the project was a "departmental project." Respondents at these sites also spoke very positively about the leadership and influence of the coordinator. What emerges here is that the coordinators were sensitive, skillful leaders who had the respect of their colleagues. They were sensitive to the ownership issues and were skillful in creating the sense of ownership on the part of those targeted for change.

Role of faculty in initial stages. The general pattern seemed to be that a few faculty members plus the dean (and perhaps some departmental chairs) were involved in conceptualizing the project and in writing the proposal. For the most part, the faculty learned of the project after funding had been approved.

At two sites, a "needs assessment" was conducted with the faculty prior to developing a proposal. At one of the sites, faculty were also asked what "incentive" they would need to become involved. Where the faculty had been involved in the early stages of project development, and particularly where needs and interests were assessed prior to writing the proposal, there seemed to be a greater continuing involvement.

Summary: Leadership and Management

Table 4.10 presents a composite summary of the leadership and management aspects of the eleven sites included in the study. The profile of the leadership and management of a dean's grant project based on the composite data included in Table 4.10 and the composite data on motivation presented in Table 4.2 indicate that:

> The institution identified the need to improve the preparation of regular education students to function in regular education settings which include handicapped children; and saw the opportunity to obtain external funds to address this as well as some other institutional needs.
>
> The application for a dean's grant was initiated by the dean and/or special education faculty, who then involved regular education faculty.
>
> Once the grant was approved, the day-to-day management of the project was assumed by a project coordinator, usually one of the faculty members involved in writing the proposal.
>
> The project coordinator could be either from special education or regular education and, if from regular education, would be a senior, well-established member of the faculty.
>
> The dean remained involved in the project, but to a lesser degree.
>
> The project was identified as the coordinator's project, possibly in conjunction with the dean.
>
> With the exception of a few faculty involved in the planning/writing of the proposal, most faculty learned of the project after the grant was approved.

Table 4.10

Summary: Leadership and Management

Project	Leadership in Initiation of Project	Leadership Managing Project	Project Coordinator Role and Status	Perception of Dean's Role	Perception of Project Identity	Role of Faculty*** in Initial Stages
#1	Dean* Regular ed. faculty	Regular ed. faculty** Dean	Regular ed.--junior faculty	Directly involved; leadership	Dean's project	Learned of project after funding approved
#2	Special ed. faculty	Special ed. faculty** Regular ed. faculty	Special ed.--newly arrived on campus	Minimal involvement	Regular ed. departmental project	Involved in planning
#3	Special ed. faculty* Regular ed. faculty	Special ed. faculty	Special ed.--junior faculty	Facilitator role	Coordinator's project	Few involved in planning; most learned of project after funding
#4	Dean* Regular ed. faculty	Regular ed. faculty	Regular ed.--senior faculty	Minimal involvement	Coordinator's project	Learned of project after funding
#5	Special ed. faculty* Dean Regular ed. faculty°	Special ed. faculty	Special ed.--hired to run project	Minimal involvement	Dean's project Special ed. project Coordinator's project	Learned of project after funding
#6	Dean* Regular ed. faculty Special ed. faculty	Regular ed. faculty** Dean	Regular ed.--senior faculty	Facilitator role	Coordinator's project	Involved in planing

Table 4.10 (cont.)

Project	Leadership in Initiation of Project	Leadership Managing Project	Project Coordinator Role and Status	Perception of Dean's Role	Perception of Project Identity	Role of Faculty*** in Initial Stages
#7	Special ed. faculty* Dean	Regular ed. faculty** Dean	Regular ed.--senior faculty	Directly involved; leadership	Dean's project	Knew of application
#8	Dean* Special ed. faculty Regular ed. faculty	Regular ed. faculty** Dean	Regular ed.--senior faculty	Directly involved; leadership	Dean's project Coordinator's	Learned of project after funding
#9	Dean* Special ed. faculty Regular ed. faculty	Special ed. faculty** Regular ed. faculty Dean	Special ed.--junior faculty	Facilitator role	Regular ed. departmental project	Learned of project after funding
#10	Special ed. faculty	Special ed. faculty	Special ed.--newly arrived on campus	Facilitator role	Special ed. project	Little or none
#11	Special ed. faculty* Dean Regular ed. faculty	Special ed. faculty** Regular ed. faculty** Dean	Special ed.--senior faculty Regular ed.--senior faculty	Directly involved; leadership	Special ed. project REgular ed.	Learned of project after funding

*Primary initiator.

°Not teacher preparation.

**Primary leadership/management

***Faculty--not deans, administrators, department chairs, or those who wrote proposal.

Discussion

The leadership and management of the DGP were explored in this study from several different perspectives, including the role of the dean in initiating the project and his/her continuing involvement after the grant had been received. Another focus was the day-to-day management of the project and the role of the project coordinator. In exploring the importance of the dean's leadership in effecting change, the findings are consistent with three other studies of the DGP.

Sivage, Reinhard and Arends (1981) studied the role of the dean as an advocate of change and found that, as change agents, deans play many roles--negotiator, persuader, and choreographer of the many constituent actors in the change process. The role of advocate, the intensity of the advocacy, and the faculty perception of the advocacy were critical in the change process.

In another study, Whitmore (1981) found that in those projects which have been most successful, the deans provided strong visible support and the faculty perceived the dean as directing the project. A critical factor in successful projects was the dean's leadership, where the dean was directly involved, indicating the dean's understanding of the goals of the project and a commitment to being involved in the planning and implementation of the project.

As a test of one of the fundamental assumptions of the DGP--that the authority to promote change is invested in the deanship--Okun (1981) conducted a study of deans' perceptions of their ability to promote change in schools of education. She found that deans perceive themselves to be in key positions to influence change in their schools. While this ability could be affected by institutional and environmental factors, the deans and target faculty agreed that if the dean wanted a program to be effective, its chances of success were greatly enhanced.

Another important factor in effecting change was the role of the project coordinator who in all cases was responsible for the day-to-day management of the project. The dean provided prestige and clout, but it was the coordinator, in daily interactions with faculty, who could keep the project moving toward its goals. The style and personality of the coordinator seemed more important than role and status. Where the coordinator was a skillful and sensitive person who supported faculty and encouraged their feelings of ownership of the project, the chances of enduring change being effected were enhanced.

It was also important that goals in applying for the grant were clear and understood and agreed to by all concerned. If feedback from the field indicated that graduates were not adequately prepared to function in mainstreamed classrooms, but the faculty were either not aware or did not agree with the assessment, efforts to improve the program would be more difficult.

One of the goals implicit in the DGP was bridging the schism between regular and special education. As special education departments received more attention and funds, the competition between the departments increased. Thus, to encourage faculty to collaborate rather than compete required skillful and sensitive leadership from the dean and/or project coordinator.

Faculty Development

In referring to the implementation of dean's grant projects, Behrens and Grosenick (1978) indicated that of the more than 200 colleges and universities which had dean's grants most faced two basic problems: (1) finding the most effective way to create positive faculty attitudes toward handicapped children and toward PL 94-142; and (2) preparing the faculty to engage in reconceptualization and restructuring of teacher education programs.

An overwhelming proportion of dean's grant projects had faculty development components with objectives directed toward: increasing faculty awareness, knowledge and understanding of PL 94-142 and the education of handicapped children and youth in the least restrictive settings; creating positive attitudes toward the law and the handicapped; and engaging the faculty in curriculum revision.

Data were sought to determine: the scope and focus of faculty development components; the targeted faculty; the objectives; the strategies and activities used to engage the faculty; and the outcomes and accomplishments.

A brief profile of the faculty development component for each of the sites includes:

Scope: size of school of education faculty.

Pre-grant status: level of faculty awareness prior to the dean's grant project.

> Target faculty: faculty toward whom project activities were directed, e.g., undergraduate elementary education faculty.
>
> Objectives: reported objectives for the faculty development component of the project.
>
> Strategies and activities: the means used to achieve the objectives.
>
> Outcomes and accomplishments: self-reported progress or accomplishment in faculty development.

Following the individual profile summaries, cross-site summaries of the faculty development components are presented.

Profile: Site #1

This project, which was in the second year of an operational grant, had had a one-year planning grant, with one intervening year between the planning year and the operational grant. Prior to the planning grant, the faculty were "not really aware" of PL 94-142. The faculty development component focused on all faculty in the school of education. During the "hiatus" year, between the planning grant and the dean's grant project, faculty were involved in activities designed to increase their awareness of PL 94-142 and education of the handicapped.

In the first year of the operational grant, the faculty development objectives were designed to improve attitudes and sensitivity and increase knowledge and understanding of PL 94-142 and the education of handicapped children in the least restrictive environment. A second aim was to assist the faculty to develop the skills to review, analyze, and modify curriculum to prepare preservice regular educators for mainstreamed classrooms.

Figure 4.1

Faculty Development: Site #1

Scope: School of Education Faculty: 46 (includes 14 from Laboratory School)
Pre-grant Status: Faculty not really aware of PL 94-142

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
All faculty in School of Education: 32	Develop positive attitudes/sensitivity toward handicapped kids and LRE. Increased knowledge of PL 94-142. Develop skill to revise curriculum--re prepare preservice. Revise own teaching skills.	Retreat--on regular time. Field visits--school for deaf; special classes; mainstream classrooms. Materials--films. Release all faculty--2 days--work on curriculum revision (students in field assignments).	Faculty saw need to change--began to revise total curriculum structure. Approximately 60% of faculty participated in at least one DGP activity. Higher education faculty who considered themselves as expert became learners--learned from practitioners, handicapped.

An implicit goal was to have faculty improve their own teaching. "If we could get our faculty to change their methods of instruction, that means our students will go out with a background of new methods. We must model--we can't just tell students to go out and use individualized instruction."

The major strategy used to achieve these objectives was bringing regular education faculty and special education faculty together to plan. This was done through dinner meetings, one retreat (on regular time, not a weekend), workshops using handicapped persons as resources, and visits to special education and mainstreamed sites. One major activity was arranging for all students to have two days of field trips to handicapped education settings, and allowing the faculty to be free of classes for those two days to work on curriculum revision. Faculty also reviewed materials, films, filmstrips, and other educational resources.

Approximately 60% of the faculty participated in at least one activity sponsored by the dean's grant project. One major accomplishment reported by project leadership was that the faculty saw the need to change and began to look at the curriculum as a whole, possibly leading to change in the structure of the teacher preparation program. A second outcome was that higher education faculty, who had considered themselves to be "experts," became learners--learning from practitioners in the field and from handicapped persons.

Profile: Site #2

This dean's grant project was in its fourth year. The first three years were directed to on-campus faculty development and curriculum revision. In this fourth year, the project was moving into an outreach phase, providing faculty development for several small colleges in the area.

A needs assessment conducted prior to initiating the dean's grant indicated that the faculty had some awareness of PL 94-142, but did not see any implications for their own teaching. The first year of the project emphasized faculty development with a clear focus toward curriculum revision, and included the whole department. Objectives were to improve faculty awareness, attitudes, and knowledge of PL 94-142 and the education of the handicapped, leading to increased skill in adaptation of curriculum to include content on the education of the handicapped.

The activities and strategies used to achieve these objectives were based on the faculty's suggestions for "incentives" to participate. Activities included a faculty retreat each year, seminars and workshops using outside consultants and handicapped persons as resources, and a special course for the faculty on the education of the handicapped in mainstreamed settings given by the project coordinator. Each semester, one faculty member was given released time to work on curriculum adaptation and revision or related research.

Figure 4.2

Faculty Development: Site #2

Scope: Education Faculty: 16

Pre-grant Status: Faculty--some awareness of PL 94-142, but did not see implications for own teaching. Attitude toward mainstreaming--generally positive.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
All faculty in Education Department: 16	Awareness of PL 94-142. Attitudes toward PL 94-142, handicapped. Knowledge about educationally handicapped. Skill in adaptation of curriculum.	Pre-grant needs assessment re incentive to participate (release time, travel money, materials money, consultants). Fall retreat each year. Seminars with handicapped. Use of consultants. Release time--selected faculty to work on curriculum revision or research. Special course for faculty. Most effective: Retreats Release time Direct contact with handicapped.	All faculty, but 2, participated in some activities. Assessment showed: Attitude change Increased awareness Increased knowledge Faculty change mostly in awareness and attitude, knowledge to a lesser extent. Faculty realization of how comprehensive education can become, and its costs. "Awareness on part of faculty of obligation...if our students are going to be successful, we must help them to be aware of handicapped kids and mainstreaming."

In the outreach phase (year 4), some faculty were used as trainers for faculty in other colleges, putting them in a role with responsibility and leadership in the project.

All but two faculty participated in project activities. Reported outcomes based on local assessment showed changes in faculty attitudes, awareness, and knowledge.

Faculty change was "mostly in awareness and attitude; knowledge to a lesser extent, but at least we now have a base for work with the handicapped. Prior to the [project] not only did the faculty not know anything about working with the handicapped, some probably resisted learning anything about them."

There was "faculty awareness of our obligation that if our students are going to be successful, we must help them to be aware of handicapped kids and mainstreaming."

The most effective activity for the department were the retreats which provided the "opportunity to come together as a faculty around some common issues--partly business and partly social." For individual faculty members, the most effective strategy was released time to work on curriculum revision, to develop new bibliographies, syllabi, and materials.

The seminars with handicapped persons were also very effective, as was putting faculty in leadership (trainer) roles in the outreach parts of the project.

Profile: Site #3

At the time that the dean's grant proposal was written, the school of education was undergoing some important change. The proposal was initiated by a special education faculty member who had just arrived on campus and who became project coordinator. A faculty member from regular education was contacted to become co-coordinator, and the proposal was written by the two co-coordinators. At that time, there was an acting dean in the school of education; the current dean arrived mid-year, after the proposal was submitted but prior to receiving approval of the grant. Just before beginning the project, the co-coordinator from regular education learned that this would be his final year at the university. Although he served as coordinator during the first year of the project, his department made no effort to replace him on the project after he left the university. In the next two years, the portion of funds allocated for the co-coordinator was used to give selected faculty members released time to work on curriculum revision.

The faculty development aspects of the project were designed to foster commitment on the part of regular education faculty to see the education of the handicapped as a shared responsibility, and to engage the faculty in modifying the curriculum to prepare regular educators with the competency to educate handicapped children in mainstreamed settings.

Figure 4.3

Faculty Development: Site #3

Scope: School of Education Faculty: 60 (includes 22 in Laboratory School).

Pre-grant Status: Faculty somewhat aware of PL 94-142;
Regular Education faculty believed PL 94-142 "would go away"; and even if handicapped kids don't go away, they will be someone else's responsibility.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Teacher Education faculty (about 30). Vocational Education, School Services faculty--about 30 (to lesser extent).	Foster commitment of Regular Education faculty to see education of handicapped as a shared responsibility. Engage faculty in curriculum revision.	Collect, review materials from other projects. "Brown-bag lunches"--outside speakers. One-on-one. Release time for selected faculty to work on curriculum revision. Most Effective: "one-on-one"--direct work with targeted faculty; sharing materials.	Increased awareness of special student. Increased understanding of teachers in mainstreamed settings. Some faculty change--more working together. Overall--minimal faculty change, especially re implications for own teaching.

The coordinator took a low-key, low-profile approach, working mostly one-on-one with faculty to assist in revising courses. The coordinator found passive resistance to be very strong.

Reported progress indicates some increase in faculty awareness and understanding of handicapped children and the needs of teachers in mainstreamed classes. But, overall, faculty change was described as minimal, especially in regard to the implications for their own teaching.

Site #4

The dean's grant proposal was initiated by the dean, but written by two regular education faculty. Special education faculty served as consultants.

The faculty development component focused on those faculty members who taught the professional education courses for undergraduate elementary and secondary education. In the first year of the project, activities were aimed at increasing faculty awareness, attitude, and knowledge of the law and its implications for education. Seminars, workshops, and site visits were used and faculty participated on a voluntary basis.

Another aim was for faculty to increase their skills to revise the curriculum to prepare regular educators with competencies to function in mainstreamed settings. Two "on-campus retreats," all-day planning sessions, were used and considered to be very effective.

This project encountered considerable resistance from both the regular education faculty--who were not sure that mainstreaming was a

Figure 4.4

Faculty Development: Site #4

Scope: School of Education Faculty: 68

Pre-grant Status: Faculty may have been aware of PL 94-142, but very little awareness of implications for own teaching. Very limited idea of LRE; some saw it as "watering down" curriculum"; others saw it as siphoning away resources from gifted and talented.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Elementary Education, Secondary Education faculty: 25-40 (includes Special Education faculty)	Increased awareness of, sensitivity to needs, interests, abilities of handicapped kids. Increased knowledge, understanding of handicapped conditions and implications for education. Skill: engage in curriculum revision, prepare regular educators for LRE settings.	Seminars, workshops--consultants, handicapped, parents, practitioners. Site visits. On-campus retreat--curriculum planning. Release time for selected faculty--curriculum revision. Most effective: on-campus retreat; curriculum planning.	Increased awareness, sensitivity on the part of most faculty. Increased knowledge--fewer faculty. Faculty resist change: Regular educators--not sure it's a good idea Special educators--saw it as impinging on their own turf. "Faculty resist 'being developed' and learning new ways of working." "Can increase knowledge; changing attitudes much more difficult."

135

good idea--and special education faculty who saw it impinging on their own turf.

The outcomes reported by this project included a general increase in faculty awareness of PL 94-142 and its implications for the education of the handicapped. To a lesser extent, there was also change in faculty attitudes and increase in the knowledge and skill levels.

Profile: Site #5

The dean's grant proposal was initiated by faculty in the physical education department who had previously worked with special education programs. The head of the teacher preparation center was not interested in the project and did not support the effort.

The focus of this dean's grant project was to affect faculty across six schools and 25 departments. The aim was to modify curriculum to prepare graduates from a wide range of disciplines to serve handicapped clientele more effectively. The project also aimed to increase faculty awareness, university-wide, and to engage faculty in curriculum revision on a selective basis.

In order to achieve increased faculty awareness, the coordinator conducted a workshop in each department. On the basis of recommendations from the dean and chairs, about 40 faculty were identified to work on curriculum revision over the three years of the project. The coordinator, working one-on-one with the faculty member and providing supporting materials and resources, was the primary means of achieving curriculum revision.

Figure 4.5

Faculty Development: Site #5

Scope: Foci university-wide--across 6 schools, approximately 25 departments.
Pre-grant Status: Faculty awareness of needs of handicapped very low.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Total faculty, university-wide, about 500.	Increased awareness of handicapped.	"General awareness" session held in each department. "Handicapped awareness"--films, simulations, panels.	About 50% of faculty generally aware --project seen as directed toward handicapped on campus. Deans, vice presidents, etc.--increased awareness/sensitivity toward handicapped.
Selected faculty--multidisciplinary, about 40-50.	Increased knowledge and skill in serving handicapped. Modify courses/curriculum.	Worked one-on-one with target faculty to modify courses. Mini-grants to provide student assistance in revising courses; e.g., research, bibliographies. Materials/resources.	Approximately 30 faculty involved in third year. 6-12 faculty really involved; changed courses, curriculum. Goal to affect entire university--too broad.
(Teacher education faculty not involved).		Most effective: one-on-one; direct assistance.	

The project reported that many of the faculty thought the project was designed to improve services and education for the handicapped students on campus, with only a small proportion recognizing the implications of preparing their graduates to serve handicapped clients.

Over the three years of the project, about 30 faculty members who were engaged in curriculum revision became very committed to the project and to the education of the handicapped. One outcome, not specifically expressed as an objective, was the increased awareness and sensitivity toward the handicapped on the part of university administrators--vice presidents, deans, and department chairs.

It should be noted that none of the teacher preparation courses were targeted for change and none of the faculty from the teacher preparation center were involved in the project. In the third year of the project, the appointment of a new director for the teacher preparation center, one who seemed more amenable to the concepts of the dean's grant project, indicated that the teacher education faculty's resistance to become involved might be diminishing.

Profile: Site #6

The faculty development component of the project was designed with two levels: to increase awareness and knowledge for the total school of education faculty; and, for those faculty who taught the elementary and secondary education courses, to develop the skills to modify the curriculum to prepare regular educators for mainstreamed settings.

Figure 4.6

Faculty Development: Site #6

Scope: School of Education Faculty: 52

Pre-grant Status: Only Special Education faculty knew of PL 94-142; others not really aware; those who were saw it as "special education problem"

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Total faculty: 52	Attitude change.	Faculty retreat.	Every faculty member participated in at least one activity: 50% attend on-campus mainstream conference; 50% attend at least one site visit.
	Increased knowledge of law.	Seminars with field-based practitioners.	
		Dinner meetings with handicapped and/or parents.	More positive attitudes.
		Mainstreaming conference on campus; university-wide, plus field based.	Increased knowledge of PL 94-142 and handicapped kids.
		Site visits to schools.	More faculty communication, collaboration, including research with focus on handicapped and LRE.
Specific focus: Elementary Education/ Secondary Education faculty.	Curriculum revision	Overload stipend to selected faculty--interdepartmental team--to study issues, concerns, implications for teacher preparation; to make recommendations for curriculum revision; and to work with other faculty on curriculum revision.	Dean: "Satisfied that we have touched greater number of faculty than with any other grant we have had."
	New instructional skills re preparing regular educators for handicapped kids in LRE.		
		Most effective: interdepartmental study team; direct contact with handicapped and/or parents.	

In addition to the activities designed specifically for school of education faculty, the project sponsored an annual on-campus mainstreaming conference to which faculty and students from other parts of the university were invited. The response was minimal even though the university had a relatively large proportion of handicapped students and was among the first to be "fully accessible."

Reported outcomes indicated that every faculty member in the school of education was involved in the project in one way or another, and that awareness, attitude, and knowledge levels were generally improved. The dean remarked: "I don't think that there is a faculty member who isn't aware of PL 94-142...I don't think there is a faculty member we haven't directly touched."

One outcome, not expressed as an objective, is that the special education faculty were also reviewing their courses and making some changes to reflect mainstreaming concepts.

Profile: Site #7

In applying for the DGP, the dean saw an opportunity to bring the faculty together, to revitalize all school of education programs, and to bring about change in the faculty's approach to the handicapped. The chair of the special education department played a key role in developing the proposal, but "did not want to run it... [he] did not want it seen as 'another special education project thrust upon us.'" The dean's council chose as the project coordinator a senior, well-respected regular education faculty member who had very little knowl-

Figure 4.7

Faculty Development: Site #7

Scope: Total School of Education Faculty: 32 full-time, 4 part-time.

Pre-grant Status: Some faculty knew of PL 94-142; most had only slight awareness.
Regular Education faculty saw education of handicapped as Special Education problem. Saw legalistic not humanistic reasons for PL 94-142.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Regular education faculty	Awareness of PL 94-142 and LRE. Attitudes. Knowledge of PL 94-142. Engage in curriculum development revision for all programs.	Needs assessment. Kick-off session--handicapped person as speaker. Brown-bag lunches with: parents of handicapped; handicapped persons; educators from field. Field visits to handicapped centers, mainstreamed classrooms--15-40 hours. Provide materials/resources. Most effective: - direct contact with handicapped persons, parents of handicapped; - field visits, brown-bag symposia; - materials/resources.	75%-100% participated in at least one activity. Increased awareness for most. Attitude change for most. Increased knowledge of PL 94-142 and LRE. Curriculum change in all programs initiated. Faculty have overcome discomfort with the handicapped. Faculty interaction improved--know each other better. Primary benefit: "Faculty beginning to see implications for own teaching--how to improve education not only for handicapped kids, but for all kids."
Special education faculty	Accept notion they do not own the kids.		

edge of PL 94-142 and the education of the handicapped. "She, thus, became a learner along with all the other participants."

The faculty knew of the proposal prior to its submission and their reactions were characterized as "ranging from indifferent to enthusiastic." Departmental chairs provided "letters of support" for the proposal.

The faculty development activities, concentrated primarily in the first year of the project, were designed to improve faculty awareness, attitudes, and knowledge of PL 94-142 and the education of the handicapped, and engaging the faculty in revising curriculum. State legislators required that regular elementary and secondary education programs include content on the education of the handicapped (defined in 11 competencies). However, this project chose to review and modify not only those two programs, but the other six in the school as well.

A variety of strategies and activities was used to attain the objectives, including "brown-bag symposia," field visits, and provision of materials and resources. One special feature of this project was the extensiveness of the faculty's field visits. During the January "term," a month between semesters when very few classes are held, there is an "unwritten understanding" that faculty are available. This time was used for dean's grant activities, and a series of field visits was scheduled. Faculty members spent from 15 to 40 hours visiting handicapped centers and mainstreamed classrooms.

The reported outcomes indicate that at least 75% of the faculty participated in at least one dean's grant activity. Even though some faculty only "went through the motions" and some "will be glad to see the project end, as change is uncomfortable," reports indicate improvement in faculty awareness of, attitudes toward, and knowledge of PL 94-142 and the education of the handicapped. Direct contact with the handicapped or the parents of handicapped children and the field visits were the most effective strategies used in this project.

Profile: Site #8

The project at this site was among the first to receive a dean's grant and was in its eighth year. The project began with focus on both graduate and undergraduate but shifted to only undergraduate because of the negative reaction on the part of the graduate faculty.

The project deliberately took a low-key approach in order to minimize faculty resistance. Also, the dean selected a regular education faculty member to be project coordinator because the special education department was very strong and would "threaten" the others.

This project was different from the others in that the major focus was to reach students directly. In the first year or two, the project had faculty development workshops, seminars, and activities similar to other project. The approach then shifted to team teaching, or using a teacher-consultant in selected sessions of classes, on the premise that student pressure would cause faculty change. The major strategy here was one-on-one--the coordinator working with individual faculty members to infuse mainstreaming concepts into their courses. Because the coordinator worked primarily on a one-to-one basis, he

Figure 4.8

Faculty Development: Site #8

Scope: School of Education Faculty: 81

Pre-grant Status: Most regular education faculty not aware of PL 94-142, or implications for preparation of regular educators.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Primary target: core of undergraduate faculty--approximately 10. Regular education preservice faculty. Special education faculty.	Assist faculty to infuse special education content into their courses. Increase competency in education of handicapped in LRE. Increase competency in regular education.	Low key, incremental approach. Primary strategy--one-on-one. Teacher-consultant--teach some sessions, 2 classes. Early in project seminars, workshops for faculty and students--used special education faculty, parents, teachers. Focused directly on students: "If we get students aware of PL 94-142 and handicapped kids, students will start asking questions, faculty will have to change." Most effective: one-on-one.	Generally increased awareness. Some change in faculty attitudes/sensitivity. Some still resistant: feel that taking from gifted/normal to give to handicapped; feel that preparing students to work with average, not special needs kids. Of 10 core faculty, major change for 70%; change medium to low for others. Strong Special Education department. Won't let regular educators forget handicapped. Some key faculty began to look at undergraduate program as total, not piecemeal.

worked with only a small number of faculty each year. But, over the course of the project, he was able to reach most departments.

The project reported that the greatest change occurred among the faculty who were directly involved in revising the curriculum. Although there was some awareness and attitude change among the others, the resistance was still pretty strong.

Profile: Site #9

This site had a small planning grant prior to submitting a proposal for a full three-year dean's grant project. The dean and the chairs from elementary education, secondary education, and special education wrote the proposal.

The college of education had highly departmentalized programs with very strong self-contained departments. Feedback from the field indicated that graduates were not prepared to function in mainstreamed settings. Somehow the feedback was not reaching the faculty who thought they were doing an excellent job of preparing students for the schools. The dean saw the dean's grant as an opportunity to develop and test a new model of teacher preparation which would cross departmental barriers and provide an integrated, generic approach for elementary education, secondary education, and special education.

After the grant was approved, the dean and chairs chose as the coordinator a faculty member who had the appropriate background but who was not strongly identified with any one department. This person had been on the faculty for a few years on a nontenured track position.

Figure 4.9

Faculty Development: Site #9

Scope: School of Education Faculty: 150
Pre-grant Status: Faculty not really aware of PL 94-142; those who were saw it as someone else's problem.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Level 1:	Increased awareness.	Needs assessment.	Faculty response--fair to low.
Total educational faculty		Brown-bag lunches.	General awareness increased school-wide.
		Use of materials, films, etc.	
Level 2:		Conference on mainstreaming with other DG projects.	
Faculty who teach core courses.	Increased knowledge, skills.	Retreat--faculty in participating departments.	Small groups really involved, benefited greatly; others so-so.
	Modify courses to infuse mainstream content.	Site visits to schools.	Faculty beginning to work across departments.
		Mini-grants for faculty to collaborate on research with mainstream focus.	
Level 3:		Informational services; resources center.	
Interdepartmental team.	Develop a model, cross-departmental education program--elementary education, special education, secondary education.	Leadership role in planning/assisting other faculty to have direct and field-based experiences with handicapped.	Faculty rethinking courses in terms of competence.
	Modification of all courses.		

The faculty development component was designed with different objectives for different segments of the faculty, with the most intensive experience designed for the interdepartmental team developing the new teacher education model. The program activities were also differentiated each year. In the first year, the emphasis was on increasing awareness and knowledge; in the second year, "mini-grants" were awarded to encourage research on topics related to the dean's grant project; in the third year, an on-campus conference was planned where faculty would present reports on their research supported by the project mini-grant.

This project reported that, generally, faculty response was fair to low. However, in spite of this, there was an increase in faculty awareness and knowledge, faculty were engaged in revising methods courses, the generic teacher preparation model was being piloted, and faculty were beginning to cross departmental barriers to work together.

Profile: Site #10

This site had had a three-year dean's grant project in one of the early cycles. The college did not consider the first cycle project as successful, and at that time did not apply for a continuing cycle. During the term of the first cycle project, a new dean was appointed and, shortly after the project ended, a new special educator joined the faculty and almost immediately wrote the proposal for a new dean's grant project. Shortly thereafter, the school of education was "writ-

Figure 4.10

Faculty Development: Site #10

Scope: School of Education Faculty: 40
Pre-grant Status:

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Earlier cycle: Focus on faculty development	Increase knowledge about education of handicapped.	Offered special education course for faculty.	Increased awareness of PL 94-142.
	Adapt courses.	Worked one-on-one.	Increased knowledge about handicapped kids.
			Few faculty adapted courses.
			More cross-departmental cooperation --special education not seen as so separate.
			"Faculty more aware of federal law and mandates whether we adhere to them or not."

ten out" of the state budget and had to engage in a "survival" battle, which led to major reorganization.

In summary, Site #10 had a three-year dean's grant project, a one-year hiatus, and was in the fourth year of a new cycle of dean's grant project. Both the dean and the project coordinator were different from those in the earlier cycle.

The earlier cycle had a faculty development component, and offered a three-credit course for faculty who could use the course toward state certification in special education. In this cycle, the primary emphasis was on offering a required "mainstreaming course" for all regular education students and some inservice training for field-based supervisors.

The project reports, however, that there has been an increase in faculty awareness and knowledge of the law and the education of the handicapped, but the major impact is directly on students.

Profile: Site #11

This site was in its third cycle of dean's grant projects. In the first two cycles, the project focused on undergraduate departments; this cycle focused on two graduate departments which prepare school administrators and counselors. The dean was involved in writing the initial proposal and had been the project director for the entire time of the project; however, there had been three different coordinators.

The faculty development component used a wide range of activities and strategies, focused on the particular targeted department. In

Figure 4.11

Faculty Development: Site #11

Scope: School of Education Faculty: 175

Pre-grant Status: Had state legislation prior to PL 94-142 re preparing regular educators for handicapped in LRE.
Faculty beginning to become aware of needs of education of handicapped.
Needs assessment: Faculty generally aware of PL 94-142; were not doing much about it in their classes.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Early cycle: Target: Undergraduate preservice teacher education about 75	Positive attitude toward handicapped in LRE. Increased knowledge about LRE concepts. Skills to revise curriculum to prepare educators for handicapped in LRE.	Awareness workshops--department chairs and 1 or 2 faculty from each department. Retreats Small group seminars One-on-one--coordinator and individual faculty. Review extensive list of competencies re curriculum revision. Interuniversity conference. Most effective: retreats; one-on-one--working with faculty to modify courses. Interuniversity activities involved faculty in leadership role--increase commitment.	Increased awareness. Increased knowledge re PL 94-142, handicapped kids, LRE. Faculty attitudes: - more comfortable with handicapped; - regular educators see own role in education of handicapped--not sole turf of special educators. Revise curriculum--infuse "critical competencies." Regular education faculty perceptions of special education more positive. More interdepartmental faculty interaction; some team teaching. Faculty involvement in schools not increased. Major outcome: Faculty sensitivity and knowledge re PL 94-142 and mainstreaming, and curriculum change resulting from that.

addition, the dean had assumed a leadership position in the region and the project sponsored interuniversity activities to provide faculty development for faculty from other universities. Faculty from the project who served as "trainers" were then engaged in a leadership role with colleagues from other institutions. Reaction from the faculty interviewed was that this was a very effective way of enlisting the active participation of faculty and increasing their commitment to the project and its goals.

This project reported that the major outcome was increased faculty sensitivity and knowledge of PL 94-142, the concepts of educating handicapped children in the least restrictive environment, and the resultant curriculum changes.

Another outcome reported by this project was the impact on the dean. Over the course of the project the dean had become not only a visible leader for dean's grant projects, but an active advocate for the effective education of handicapped children.

Summary: Faculty Development

The following tables present composite summaries of the faculty development components in the eleven sites.

Scope and focus. In general, the faculty development activities were focused on different segments of the faculty, depending on the desired outcome (Table 4.11). The activities designed to increase awareness and improve attitudes were directed toward broad segments of the faculty, or even toward the total faculty. The more intensive faculty development, including increased knowledge and skill in revis-

Table 4.11

Summary: Scope of Faculty Development

Project	Total SCDE Faculty	Targeted Faculty
#1	46 (includes 14 lab school)	32
#2	16	16
#3	60	30 (teacher ed. faculty)
#4	68	25-40 (elementary ed., secondary ed.)
#5	500 (university-wide)	I. 500 (university-wide) II. 40-50 (selected)
#6	52	I. 52 II. 36 (elementary ed., secondary ed. faculty)
#7	36	36
#8	147	I. 147 (total faculty) II. 20-30 III. 10
#10	40	40
#11	170	I. 75 (undergraduate) II. 13 (graduate)

Note: Sites #5, 6, and 9 identified different objectives for different segments of the faculty.

ing curriculum to incorporate content on the handicapped, focused primarily on the undergraduate, preservice teacher education faculty.

Objectives. The faculty development objectives were generally directed toward preparing the faculty to revise or modify the curriculum for preparation of regular educators. Most projects followed a pattern of emphasizing faculty development activities in the early stages of the project and then moving the faculty into curriculum revision activities.

All projects had faculty development objectives aimed at improving faculty awareness, attitudes, and knowledge, although the specifics of these objectives and activities varied from site to site (Table 4.12). At some sites there were different objectives for different segments of the faculty. For example, awareness and attitude change activities would be directed toward broad segments or even the total faculty, while the knowledge level and skill building objectives were targeted more specifically to faculty who would actually be engaged in

Table 4.12

Faculty Development: Objectives

Objectives	Project
Awareness	2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9
Attitude	1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11
Knowledge	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11
Skill: Curriculum Revision	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
Skill: Teaching Performance	1

revising the curriculum. Only one site indicated an objective for change in the teaching performance of its faculty.

Strategies and activities. All the projects reported using a variety of activities and approaches for faculty development (Table 4.13). Although seminars and workshops seem to be the most commonly used activities, there was considerable variation in their structure and use. Some were informal "brown-bag" lunches with resource persons, some were connected to faculty/departmental meetings, and others were more formally structured sessions with consultants. Faculty participation in seminars and workshops was generally voluntary and met with varied success. Some project coordinators reported that faculty participation was moderate to low and some felt that faculty participation might have been better if the dean had been stronger in "encouraging" attendance. Having curricular and instructional materials available was another commonly used strategy.

Released time for faculty to work on revising their courses was reported in four sites and was generally considered to be effective. In two sites, coordinators reported that curriculum revision resulting from released time did not "match" the amount of faculty time provided. The other two sites felt it was a very important and effective use of faculty time. Another strategy perceived as very effective was that of providing assistance to faculty using a one-on-one approach. Generally, this took the form of the coordinator's working directly with a faculty member to modify curriculum. A number of the sites reported that direct contact with the handicapped--either resource

Table 4.13

Faculty Development: Strategies and Activities

Strategy/Activity	Project
Retreats	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 11
Seminars/workshops	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11
Site visits	1, 4, 6, 7, 9
Teacher-consultant	8, 9
Mini-grants	5, 9
Release time	1, 2, 3, 4
Materials/resources	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11
On-campus conference	5, 6
Special course for faculty	2, 10
One-on-one assistance	3, 5, 8, 10, 11
External consultants	1, 2, 3, 4
Interdepartmental teams	6, 9
Out-of-load stipend	6

persons for seminars or children in classrooms --was very effective in changing faculty awareness, attitudes, and knowledge about the education of the handicapped.

Reported outcomes. Increased awareness was the most frequently reported outcome, particularly when referring to the total faculty or to broad segments of the faculty; attitudinal change was reported to a lesser degree (Table 4.14).

Table 4.14
Summary: Reported Outcomes of Faculty Development

Outcomes	Project
Increased awareness re PL 94-142	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
Change attitudes re handicapped	2, 6, 7, 8, 11
Increased knowledge re education of the handicapped	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11
Skill in curriculum revision	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11
Interdepartmental collaboration re teaching, research	3, 6, 9, 10, 11
Other:	
Higher education faculty became learners	1
Deans, VPs, etc.--increased awareness, knowledge, etc.	7, 11

*Faculty development activities generally began with a broad focus on increasing awareness and attitudes, and moved into activities more specifically focused on knowledge acquisition and curriculum revision skill for smaller groups of faculty.

Seven projects reported that faculty had increased their knowledge, but generally this referred to a smaller group of faculty members who were directly involved in the project. The same could be said of the skill level for revising curriculum. All but one of the projects reported some progress in engaging faculty in curriculum revision. The level of progress ranged from the planning stage to revision of all syllabi. Generally, the faculty directly involved in curriculum revision were small in number and then served as facilitators for other faculty in revising their courses.

Discussion

The importance of faculty development to achieve instructional improvement in higher education has been discussed extensively (Berquist & Phillips, 1975; Ducharme, 1981; J. Gaff, 1975; Gaff, Festa & Gaff, 1978; Lindquist, 1978; Schein, 1972). In a time of expanding resources, one means of improving instruction was to bring in new "bright, energetic young faculty." But in periods of declining resources that option is not available, and the importance of the continuing development of faculty becomes even more critical (Christensen, 1982; Keller, 1983). Such were the circumstances under which deans' grants were being implemented: the SCDE had been suffering enrollment declines and concomitant reductions in budget and staff. With many of the younger faculty members retrenched, the faculties were heavily tenured. Thus, changing instructional programs depended even more on the continuing development of the remaining faculty.

Another important factor to consider is that the kinds of educational changes mandated by implementation of PL 94-142 required broad-based instructional changes in teacher preparation programs, which had to be reconceptualized to prepare regular classroom teachers and special education teachers with the competencies to function in new, collaborative ways in the schools. Consequently, for faculty preparing those teachers new competencies were also required.

The acknowledgment of faculty development as an important approach to achieving the goals of the DGP was noted by the overwhelming proportion of dean's grant projects that had faculty development components. (Also, since faculty development was a priority at the federal level, proposals which did not include some faculty development activities were probably not rated high enough to be funded.)

In this study, faculty development activities generally preceded any effort at curriculum revision. Most projects proposed objectives that proceeded along a continuum from increased awareness to improved attitudes, to increased knowledge, and thence to increased skill in curriculum revision. Hipps (1982) suggests that an important factor in effective faculty development programs is to be clear about what faculty are being developed to do, a clear sense of the pruposes and aims of faculty development activities. The projects studied seemed to have a clear sense of purpose: to conduct faculty development activities in order to prepare the faculty to engage in curriculum revision to include content on the education of handicapped children in regular educator preparation programs. This directed focus of faculty development activities was not as evident in the early cohort of projects, with one of the deans saying that they were "not quite sure what they were being funded to do." But, as the DGP built an experience base, newer projects were able to move more rapidly toward curriculum revision.

Another aspect of the projects was the differentiated objectives for segments of the faculty. The increased awareness and knowledge levels were generally targeted for broad segments of the faculty and, perhaps, the total SCDE faculty, while the more intensive "skill for curriculum revision" level was targeted for smaller groups of faculty who would actually be involved in teaching the revised courses.

Most projects used a wide range of activities and strategies. As one dean observed:

> The faculty are as different in their needs and interests as the students. Therefore, you need a variety of approaches and strategies for faculty development.

Of the variety of strategies and approaches, those activities which directly involved the faculty member as an active participant were reported as most effective in affecting awareness, attitudes, and knowledge. Strategies which provided for experiential learning were among the most effective, including direct contact with handicapped children or their parents. This was accomplished in some instances by having handicapped persons or their parents as consultants or at workshops and seminars; in other instances, this was accomplished by site visits to special education or mainstreamed classroom settings.

Another important strategy was engaging faculty members as active participants in the learning process, both as peers and as colleagues. This was exemplified by the low-key approach used by some sites--the one-on-one collaboration. In addition, involving faculty directly in roles that required their active participation, and especially their leadership, was reported as an important strategy for increasing faculty's commitment to the project. This was particularly evidenced in those projects which included outreach, dissemination, or interuniversity activities.

Released time was the most effective strategy for actually accomplishing curriculum revision. This seemed to be not only important for the time provided, but also for the recognition given to the faculty member for his or her work.

In sum, one can conclude from the sites studied that, indeed, there was change in the levels of faculty awareness and knowledge of PL 94-142 and education of handicapped children in regular education settings, and indeed the faculty did become engaged in revising curriculum. However, the extent of those changes varied, with some sites still in the early stages of the process and others more advanced.

Curriculum Revision

One of the initial indicators of success of the DGP is the extent to which regular teacher preparation programs include the learning needs of handicapped children as an integral aspect of the program.

This study examined those curricular changes which had occurred--or had been planned--to achieve that purpose, as reported by the participant projects.

Almost all dean's grant projects had objectives aimed toward curriculum revision, usually in combination with faculty development activities designed to prepare and engage the faculty in modifying curriculum. The intended curriculum changes varied considerably from site to site, ranging from modifying specific courses to redesigning the whole curriculum. Data were sought to determine the scope/focus of proposed curriculum changes, the targeted programs or courses, the objectives for curriculum revision, strategies, and activities used to achieve the changes and the outcomes or levels of progress.

Exploration of curriculum changes included attention to such questions as:

> Was there a systematic effort to modify the curriculum?
>
> What was the general approach to curriculum revision, e.g.:
>
> > existing courses altered to include content on PL 94-142 and the education of the handicapped?
> >
> > new courses or competencies required?
>
> Were the practica requirements altered to provided students with experience in working with handicapped children?
>
> Were there any changes in the teaching arrangements (e.g., team teaching) or field supervision arrangements?
>
> Were there changes in the requirements for graduation or certification of regular educators?
>
> What is the level of progress of the planned changes?

> Are there plans to institutionalize the changes so that they will continue after the grant has ended?

The following figures present individual profiles on the curriculum revision component of each of the eleven sites. The profiles include information on scope and focus, targeted courses or programs, objectives, strategies and activities, and outcomes/accomplishments.

Following the figures, Tables 4.15 through 4.17 present composite summaries of scope/focus and target, strategies and activities, and objectives and levels of progress achieved.

Figure 4.12

Curriculum Revision: Site #1

Scope/Focus: Focus on elementary education and secondary education; undergraduate

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Professional education courses in elementary education and secondary education:	Revise all undergraduate professional education courses.	Infusion approach:	Faculty have agreed on competencies and where to "infuse" them.
		identify cluster of competencies;	Process to begin.
Elementary ed, students take 34 credits in School of Ed.; includes 12 credits in student teaching and seminar.	Revise student teaching assignments so that all students have direct experience with handicapped kids.	faculty review all courses;	Some conflict in assigning competencies--turf issues--"student contact credit hours."
	Reconceptualize whole teacher education program.	infuse competencies where appropriate;	
	Students to develop:	new course outline submitted to chair.	
Secondary ed. students take 21 credits, including student teaching.	positive attitudes re handicapped;		
	understand PL 94-142 and implications for teaching;		
Special education/elementary education certification--54 credits in School of Ed.	skills: individualizing education.		

Comment: This site, which had suffered severe enrollment decline, had set out to reconceptualize the total teacher education program using an infusion/diffusion approach. With regard to the elementary education program, the aim was to review all education courses and infuse special education content where appropriate. The secondary education program had dropped so dramatically in the preceding few years that the department was changed to Education Foundations. The Dean's Grant Project aimed to use diffusion to reach out to the disciplines where secondary education students take the major portion of their work, e.g., English, history, math.

The project was in its second year of the operational grant. The dean expressed satisfaction with "where we were going, but not satisfied with where we are."

Figure 4.13

Curriculum Revision: Site #2

Scope/Focus: Undergraduate and graduate (masters and masters plus 30)

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Every course in Education Department targeted for change: Elementary education students take 48 credits (of 126 for Bachelors) in Education Department; includes 12 credits student teaching. Secondary education students take 18 credits, including student teaching.	Revise courses--adapt cluster of competencies to assist students to develop increased awareness, positive attitudes, increased knowledge, and skills for education of handicapped in regular education settings.	Infusion approach: adapt cluster of competencies; review all courses in light of competencies, identify overlaps and gaps, assign competencies; release time for selected faculty to revise courses--new bibliographies, materials, revise syllabus; field visits for students--pair regular education and special education settings.	Revision of every course in process; some further along than others. Human growth and development courses are revised, about 50% of other courses revised; others in process. Students "much more aware" of individual differences.

Comment: This project was in its fourth year. The first three years were directed toward the faculty development and curriculum revision on its own campus. In the fourth year, the project has entered a dissemination stage, providing training and technical assistance to several other small colleges in the area. The on-campus activities have continued, but in a less intensive manner, providing support for completing the curriculum revision and maintaining/reinforcing the changes which had been accomplished.

Figure 4.14

Curriculum Revision: Site #3

Scope/Focus: Primary focus on elementary education and secondary education; focus, to a lesser extent, on physical education, vocational education, and school services.

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Foundations courses, Methods courses, Practica.	Infuse in each curriculum of every part of college of education an understanding of what special education is.	Faculty coordinators given release time to lead faculty team (other faculty teaching the courses) in redesigning courses.	Course revision in process. No focus on changing student teaching assignments.
Elementary and special education in college of education 4 years.	Modify targeted courses to infuse special education competencies where appropriate.	Analyze courses, infuse special education content where appropriate. Review materials and resources.	Little or no coordination between methods courses and student teaching.
Secondary education, 35-40 credits in college of education.	Revise syllabus.	Develop new syllabus.	Assessment measures not developed.

Comment: This project was in its second year and aimed to have a broad impact and to incorporate into each program of the school of education content to increase understanding of special education. The elementary education and secondary education methods courses and the required courses in educational foundations were specifically targeted for revision. Faculty facilitators were identified for each of the three areas to analyze courses, review existing needs and materials, identify areas which could be modified to include content on the handicapped, and then revise course outlines. The facilitators were also to assist other faculty members who taught the course to incorporate the changes. The project coordinator worked one-on-one providing support and technical assistance to the faculty facilitators. This project received considerable passive resistance from the faculty.

Figure 4.15

Curriculum Revision: Site #4

Scope/Focus: Focus on undergraduate early childhood, elementary education, and secondary education. Performance-based program.

Target	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Program/Courses			
Professional sequence:	Prepare regular educators with competency to work in mainstreamed classes --define classroom and field-based activities.	Performance-based program. Infusion approach:	Course revision in process; anticipate completion by end of project.
Early childhood/elementary education--44 credits including student teaching;	Infuse special education content into professional sequence.	Review each course in professional sequence. Review performance objectives, criteria for evaluation of objectives and enabling activities.	Syllabi in process of being revised to include competencies re handicapped in LRE. Resource room of materials.
Secondary education--24 credits including student teaching.	Every graduate to have direct experience with handicapped child.	Modify courses to incorporate special education content where appropriate. Seek more mainstreamed settings for students' field-based experience.	"Lack adequate laboratory and models in field for what we try to teach in in class." "Revising the course may be reflected in syllabus, but may not necessarily be happening in reality --particularly in the field-based piece of the course."

Comment: This project was in its third year, and focused its curriculum revision efforts on early childhood, elementary, and secondary education programs. The core professional education courses were targeted for change, using the infusion approach--analyzing courses and identifying areas into which special education content could be incorporated.

The site had experienced overall institutional budget crises but, specifically, enrollment decline and budget cuts in the school of education. Resistance to the change and "turf" issues surfaced here and were reflected in the comment by one of the faculty members, "Let's face it--the name of the game is student FTE," thus expressing a concern over who would teach the special education content.

Figure 4.16

Curriculum Revision: Site #5

Scope/Focus: University-wide, multidisciplinary.
Education program not included in the project.

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Fifty courses across 25 departments in 6 schools--undergraduate.	Revise selected courses across disciplines to prepare different disciplines to better serve handicapped clientele.	Infusion approach.	Course revision underway.
		Identify courses appropriate for change on recommendation of dean and chair.	Some courses--syllabi, reading lists--revised.
		Work individually, one-on-one, with the family to assist in course revision.	Six departments--real change and momentum to continue.
		Mini grants--support student assistance in revising course; e.g., develop new bibliography, locate new materials, etc.	Unanticipated outcome: Opened new careers for some students, widened their view of their fields and services to wider range of clientele; e.g., environmental designs for handicapped access.

Comment: This project was unique in the multidisciplinary focus across six schools throughout the university. The project did not originate in nor involve the teacher education program. The overall goal for curriculum revision was comparable to other projects--to prepare their students in a variety of disciplines to better serve the handicapped among their clientele.

The project focused on undergraduate programs and aimed to identify selected courses where incorporation of content on the handicapped would be relevant and appropriate. To identify the course, the project worked through the dean of the school, to selected department chairs, to the departmental curriculum coordinator, to selected faculty. The project coordinator then contacted the identified faculty to invite their participation. None of the faculty refused, but some offered passive resistance in not following through on the commitments for course revisions.

One of the indicators of change in this project were the student projects; e.g., environmental design required student projects to include concern for the handicapped.

Figure 4.17

Curriculum Revision: Site #6

Scope/Focus: Preservice elementary education, secondary education. Competency-based program.

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Elementary education sequence: 35 hours including 9 hours of student teaching. Secondary education sequence: 21 hours.	Prepare regular education students to function in mainstreamed settings. Revise 50% elementary education, secondary education, professional courses.	Infusion approach. Selected faculty members serve as curriculum coordinators for elementary education and secondary education--overload stipend. Faculty reviewed courses, decided which ones (50%) to revise. Curriculum coordinators review all competencies, made recommendations to faculty. Provide materials, resources, bibliography. Faculty make decisions in revisions.	In elementary education, 29 credits of 35 revised to include competencies re handicapped. Secondary ed.--most courses revised. Reflected in course outline, syllabi. Identification of mainstreamed settings for student teaching placements; using alumni and field supervisors to help locate sites. Assessment showed goals of curriculum revision are being met. Curriculum revision being achieved by individuals--"not sure about departments."

Comment: In this project, elementary education students have a dual major--one in liberal arts and one in elementary education (35 credit hours). Secondary education students take a major in a discipline and a minor in education (21 credit hours). The curriculum revision efforts focused on the undergraduate preservice elementary and secondary education programs, with 50% of the professional courses specifically targeted for change. The decision to target 50% of the courses was made after the faculty had reviewed all courses and identified those in which revision seemed reasonable and appropriate.

Special education faculty were involved in the interdepartmental teams which studied the issues involved in mainstreaming, and made recommendations for curriculum revision. However, some special education faculty advocated that regular education students take a required course in "education of the handicapped in mainstreamed settings," taught by special education faculty, rather than infuse special education content into regular education courses. It did not appear likely that additional courses would be required at this point.

Figure 4.18

Curriculum Revision: Site #7

Scope/Focus: Graduate and undergraduate;
Eight programs: elementary education, secondary education, special education, early childhood, school counselor, bilingual education, educational administration, school psychologist, reading specialist.
Competency-based program.

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
All eight programs:	Revise all 8 credential programs to incorporate LRE competencies.	Infusion approach:	"Outcomes exceeding expectations."
Elementary education: 24-30 credits including 16 credits of student teaching.	Over 100 courses in School of Education; revise syllabi accordingly.	Identify all LRE competencies.	All 8 departmental programs being revised; 90% courses revised.
	Develop materials to support/facilitate revisions.	Develop master matrix of all LRE competencies.	Master list of competencies revised, includes LRE competencies.
Secondary education: professional sequence.	Pilot revisions.	Faculty assign competencies to courses.	Syllabi revised.
		Collapse competencies into instructional objectives.	Materials to support revisions developed.
		Revise syllabi.	No change in student teaching assignments.

Comment: This site had set out to use the Dean's Grant as a means of revitalizing all programs in the school of education leading to teaching or specialist credentials. In the third year of the project, this site reported that it had accomplished what it had set out to do--a widespread impact that helped to increase faculty and student awareness of the educational needs of handicapped students in mainstreamed settings. Approximately 90% of the syllabi had been revised; the others were in process. There was no change in student teaching assignments, but it was assumed that most classrooms were now mainstreamed. Some expressed such concerns as: (1) how to be sure that what was in the syllabi was being implemented in the classroom; (2) getting special educators to accept the concept of the least restrictive environment for handicapped children; (3) provision for ongoing inservice training for faculty joining the college after the completion of the project.

Figure 4.19

Curriculum Revision: Site #8

Scope/Focus: Undergraduate
Seven programs

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Professional education sequence: Students enter school of education in junior year; take 24-36 credits, including 6 credits of student teaching.	Produce change in preservice regular education programs to prepare regular education students to service handicapped in LRE. Provide preservice regular education students with experiences to develop competency for education of handicapped in LRE. Provide special education students with more experience with regular classes.	Infusion approach. Series of seminars for students and faculty; use handicapped persons as resources. Teacher consultant: teach some sessions of course; work with faculty to infuse handicapped content into course. One-on-one.	Changes reflected more in faculty members' attitudes and knowledge than in course outlines. Students--more positive attitudes toward handicapped. Students report they are better prepared to work with handicapped. Special education department resisted their students' having regular education field experiences; "didn't want to give up time"--turf.

Comment: This project, in its eighth year, was among the first group of grantees awarded a Dean's Grant. In the first year, the project focused on the graduate as well as undergraduate programs. However, because of the negative reaction from faculty in the graduate-level programs, the project shifted to a focus on the undergraduate program.

The main strategy used for curriculum revision was one-on-one, with the project coordinator working directly with selected faculty members to assist in revising the courses. The coordinator, a teacher-consultant, also taught selected sessions of courses to model the incorporation of special education content into the curriculum. Using the intensive one-on-one approach, the coordinator worked with only two or three departments each year.

The courses targeted for change were in the professional education sequence.

Figure 4.20

Curriculum Revision: Site #9

Scope/Focus: Undergraduate
Elementary education, secondary education

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Professional sequence: Undergraduate elementary education; secondary education.	Develop cross-departmental modes for for teacher education; combine elementary education, secondary education, special education--33 credits of coursework plus field-based experience. Modify other education courses.	Interdepartmental team--develop pilot; work with 20 students. Infusion approach. Teacher consultant--teach some sessions of courses. Provide information and materials --assist in infusing LRE competencies in courses.	Nine of 20 students in pilot program completed. Syllabi for most methods courses revised; education students required to do unit on handicapped. Use of computer programming assures that all students visit or work in mainstreamed settings. State requirement: all education students now to take 3-credit course, "Survey of Special Education."

Comment: This site used a complex design for its project, with multiple levels of objectives for faculty development and multiple foci for curriculum revision. One focus of curriculum revision was the development and piloting of a generic teacher preparation model, bringing together the common core of experience for elementary education, secondary education, and special education. Concurrently, other education courses were being analyzed to incorporate content related to the education of the handicapped in mainstreamed settings. A third aspect of the curriculum revision effort involved using educational technology to assure that every student had direct experience with the handicapped.

The school of education was in the process of major reorganization at the time of the Dean's Grant. Since the project was in its third and final year, there was some concern expressed as to whether the changes would be sustained through and beyond the reorganization.

Figure 4.21

Curriculum Revision: Site #10

Scope/Focus: Undergraduate
Elementary education, secondary education

Target Program/Courses	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Education students take B.A. in some area; take 29-32 credits in education, including student teaching. (Previously had been 45 credits; reorganization limits education sequence to 32.)	Prepare elementary education, secondary education preservice students to function in mainstreamed settings. Combine theoretical with direct contact experience. Students develop positive attitudes combined with knowledge and skill. Provide some training for supervisory teachers in the field.	Required 3-credit course for all elementary education, secondary education students; focus of course is on handicapped in mainstreamed settings. Provide some training for field supervisors.	Institution required mainstreaming course even though there was major change in university organization, and the need to cut 13 credits from professional education sequence, mainstreaming course remains; was never a target for "dropping." Attitude change among regular education students re work with handicapped.

Comment: The project was in the fourth year of the second phase of the Dean's Grant Project, the earlier phase having occurred under a different dean and project coordinator. The curriculum revision aspect of this project involved a structural change, that is, requiring a 3-credit course in the education of the handicapped in regular education settings. The project coordinator also worked with selected faculty and field supervisors of field placements to assure congruence between experiential and theoretical parts of the program.

The school of education had undergone major reorganization and budget problems during the time of the project. Even though the maximum number of professional education credits was reduced, the required special education course was left intact.

Figure 4.22

Curriculum Revision: Site #11

Scope/Focus: Early cycle focus on undergraduate, preservice early childhood and elementary education, secondary education, special education, vocational education, physical education.
Current cycle focus on graduate programs in educational administration and counseling.

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
Undergraduate--35-50 credits in Department of Curriculum and Teaching--all methods courses, student teaching. Graduate curricula for educational administration and school counselors.	Revise curricula to facilitate preparation of educators for new roles related to handicapped in LRE.	Developed "pilot" 2-semester (6-credit) course re handicapped in mainstreamed settings for regular education and special education students; course team-taught. Pilot course used as basis for identifying mainstreaming competencies. Developed list of critical competencies for mainstreaming. Analyzed courses, decided where mainstream competencies to be incorporated. Project coordinator works one-on-one with faculty to assist in incorporating competencies. Used faculty facilitator to support, facilitate curriculum revision in own department. Revise syllabi, bibliographies, course outlines to reflect changes.	Discontinued teaching pilot course after 3 years on premise that those competencies incorporated into regular education courses. "Real reason may have been that the project coordinator who taught the course no longer with the project." Undergraduate preservice curriculum revised to incorporate competencies for mainstreaming. No real change in student teaching assignments, but assume most public schools are mainstreamed. Curriculum changes reflected in syllabi, bibliographies, course outlines. Students have competencies, skills, knowledge they would not have without DCP. Graduate level: educational administration, counseling--course revisions under way.

Figure 4.22 (cont.)

Target Faculty	Objectives	Strategies/Activities	Outcomes/Accomplishments
			Special education became more interested in regular education problems. Developed and demonstrated a workable model for faculty development, curriculum revision, and outreach to other institutions.

Comment: This site is a large state university and the project here has been in existence since the Dean's Grant Project was initiated at the federal level. The dean has been the dean and project director over the entire term of the project, but there have been three different coordinators.

Over the course of the project, curriculum revision efforts focused first on several undergraduate programs, and then on two graduate departments. Also, as the dean assumed a leadership role in the region, the project faculty became involved in sponsoring interuniversity activities, providing faculty development or curriculum revision support for other colleges and universities.

This institution had experienced some enrollment decline and several budget reductions. There was one point when the state legislature considered closing the school of education, and the faculty became involved in a critical survival effort.

Summary: Curriculum Revision

Scope/focus and target. Of the eleven sites, seven targeted their curriculum revision efforts on the undergraduate preservice teacher education program, three sites targeted graduate as well as undergraduate programs, and one site targeted undergraduate programs in multidisciplinary areas but did not include the teacher education programs.

The major curriculum revision efforts focused on the undergraduate, preservice elementary (including early childhood) and secondary education programs, which were targeted for modification in ten sites. Of the ten, three included other undergraduate programs (vocational education, physical education, special education), and three included graduate-level programs in their curriculum revision efforts. Three of the sites specifically mentioned the special education program as a target for modification to include concepts of mainstreaming. At some of the other sites, special education was part of a dual certification with elementary education and thus, by implication, was at least partly targeted for change.

Most of the curriculum revision was focused on the professional sequence of courses, the foundations and methods courses, which generally represented from 18 to 36 credits for each program. In some instances, this included every course taught in the school of education, since most of the liberal arts courses were taught in other schools or departments. In only one site was total reconceptualization of teacher preparation programs the focus.

Table 4.15 presents a summary of the scope/focus and target by site.

Table 4.15

Curriculum Revision: Scope/Focus and Target

Project	Scope/Focus	Target
#1	Undergraduate elementary ed., secondary ed.	Professional ed. courses: - elementary ed.: 34 credits including 12 credits student teaching; - secondary ed.: 21 credits including student teaching.
#2	Undergraduate and graduate	Every course in education dept.: - elementary ed.: 48 credits including student teaching; - secondary ed.: 18 credits including student teaching.
#3	Undergraduate: primary focus on elementary ed., secondary ed.; lesser focus on physical ed., vocational ed., school services.	Foundations courses, methods courses, practica
#4	Undergraduate: early childhood, elementary ed., secondary ed.	Professional ed. sequence: - early childhood, elementary ed.--44 credits including student teaching; - secondary ed.--24 credits including student teaching.
#5	Undergraduate: university-wide, multidisciplinary (teacher ed. program not included.	50 courses across 25 depts. in 6 schools

Table 4.15 (cont.)

Project	Scope/Focus	Target
#6	Undergraduate elementary ed., secondary ed.	50% of professional ed. sequence: - elementary ed.--36 credits including 9 credits student teaching; - secondary ed.--21 credits including student teaching.
#7	Graduate and undergraduate: all credential programs--elementary ed., secondary ed., special ed., early childhood, school counselor, bilingual ed., ed. administration, school psychologist, reading specialist.	Professional ed. sequence: - elementary ed.--24-30 credits including 16 credits student teaching; - secondary ed.; - graduate programs.
#8	Undergraduate: 7 programs	Professional ed. sequence: 24-36 credits including 6 credits student teaching.
#9	Undergraduate elementary ed., secondary ed.	Professional ed. sequence New cross-departmental teacher ed. model: 33 credits plus field-based experiences.
#10	Undergraduate elementary ed., secondary ed.	Professional ed. sequence: 29-32 credits including student teaching.
#11	Undergraduate: early childhood, elementary ed., secondary ed., special ed., vocational ed., physical ed.	Undergraduate professional sequence: 35-50 credits.
	Graduate: ed. administration, school counselor	Graduate: courses for ed. administrators, school counselors.

Approach, strategies, and activities. A summary of the approach, strategies, and activities (Table 4.16) shows that the most prevalent approach to curriculum revision in dean's grant projects was "infusion." This was defined in most sites as modifying existing education courses to include content on PL 94-142 and the education of the handicapped. Ten of the eleven sites identified infusion as their approach. However, in practice there was considerable variety in what that meant.

At two sites, teacher consultants were used to teach selected sessions of targeted methods or foundations courses. At some sites, existing courses were reviewed to determine where content on the handicapped could be included. Other sites first developed a master list of competencies necessary for regular educators in mainstreamed settings, then reviewed existing courses and allocated competencies where appropriate. Four sites reported efforts to alter field placements to include direct work with handicapped children to provide experiential support for classroom theory. Two sites indicated that a new course in special education was required for regular education students; six sites reported changes in required competencies.

A wide range of strategies was used to implement this approach. Two sites used interdepartmental teams to study the issues, review the curriculum, and make recommendations for curriculum modification to larger faculty groups. Some used faculty facilitators who were given released time to coordinate or facilitate curriculum revision within a department. Two sites provided mini-grants to support faculty in

Table 4.16

Curriculum Revision: Approach, Strategies, and Activities

Approach/Strategies/Activities	Project
Approach	
Infusion approach	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11
New course requirements	9, 10
Changes in field-based practica experiences	2, 4, 9, 10
Changes in required competencies	1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11
Changes in syllabi	1, 3, 7, 11
Strategies/Activities	
Interdepartmental faculty teams	6, 9
Mini-grants: research, curriculum development	5, 9
Teacher consultant	8, 9
Faculty facilitator	3, 6
Released time for faculty	2, 4
One-on-one assistance in curriculum revision	3, 5, 8, 11

initiating curriculum revision or research on related topics. Five sites used a one-on-one consultation to assist selected faculty. Project coordinators generally took an active role in working with faculty on curriculum revision.

Objectives and level of progress achieved. Revising regular education courses was one objective included at ten projects. Two sites reported that the planned changes had been achieved; three reported that some courses had been revised and others were still in process. Four sites reported that the planned curriculum revision was in process; and one site reported no change (Table 4.17).

Revising syllabi was the most frequently mentioned means of documenting curriculum changes. Four sites reported that this had been accomplished, and three others reported that this was in process.

Altering field placement assignments was another objective that was either explicitly or implicitly included in a majority of projects. Of the nine sites that referred to changing field placements to assure that students had experience with handicapped children, only one reported that this objective had been achieved; two reported that this was "in process"; and the other six indicated "no change." Some of those sites also indicated that they assumed most public school classrooms were mainstreamed and therefore their students were having experience with handicapped children. Two sites, however, reported this to be a problem, saying that the field-based experiences were not consistent with classroom theory, and students were receiving confusing messages.

Table 4.17

Curriculum Revision: Objectives and Level of Program Achieved

	Level of Progress Achieved										
	Projects										
Objective	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11
Revise regular education courses	NC	A IP	IP	IP	IP	A IP	A	A	IP		A IP
Revise special education courses								NC			
Revise required competencies	IP	IP		IP			A		IP		A
Revise syllabi			IP	IP	IP	A	A		A		A
Revise field experiences	NC	IP	NC	NC		IP	NC		A	NC	NC
New resources/materials		A		A		A	A		A		
New requirement for graduation (new course)									A	A	
New model teacher preparation program	NC								IP		
Students develop new awareness, attitudes, knowledge, skills	NI	A	NI	NI	IP	NI	NI	A	A	A	A

Status: A = achieved NC = little or no change
IP = in process NI = no information

Discussion

In keeping with the purpose and intent of the DGP as initiated by OSEP, curriculum revision efforts were focused primarily on the undergraduate preservice elementary and secondary programs. For the most part, it was the professional education sequence of approximately 18 to 36 credit hours which were targeted for change. This was appropriate, but it also represented that part of a student's program over which the SCDE faculty had control. Generally, education students entered the education programs in their junior year. In only a few instances were students admitted to the SCDE as freshmen. This was especially true for secondary education students who generally enrolled in the department of their major discipline, and took only the professional education courses--foundations, methods, and student teaching--in the SCDE.

The most prevalent approach to curriculum revision was described as "infusion," that is, incorporating content on the education of handicapped children in regular education courses. Only one site used the addition of a required course in the education of handicapped children in mainstreamed settings as the major approach to curriculum revision. The DGP was designed around the broad general principle that regular educators needed to know more about educating handicapped children in regular education settings, and that the dichotomy between regular and special education had to be bridged. As the DGP developed, discussions and writings on curriculum revision frequently suggested "expanding the content and context of regular education to include educational needs as an integral part." Thus, infusion was inferred and became a dominant approach.

There were other reasons for this approach as well. With the limited number of credits available for education courses, it was easier and more economical to infuse new content into existing courses than to require an additional course. It was also politically easier. Changing the content of courses already in place generally required only the approval of those directly involved or, possibly, faculty in the SCDE. Other changes, such as developing and adding new courses or changing graduation requirements generally required approval from multilevel curriculum committees.

One advantage of the infusion approach is that not only do faculty become involved, but they also become learners and acquire new knowledge themselves. In addition, as courses are reviewed for infusion, other content is reviewed as well, with the need to delete some material to make room for new content. Sometimes the process of reviewing courses for infusion led to a broader examination of the total curriculum.

One disadvantage of this approach is that it frequently becomes "faculty specific"--those faculty who revise the courses will be the ones who teach them. But even if the syllabi are revised accordingly, it is difficult to ensure that other faculty who teach the courses will incorporate the new content.

Turf issues--who teaches what content to whom--arise in curriculum revision. With the concern about student credit hours, special educators have been eager to require regular education students to take a special education course. Regular educators, in spite of some feeling that education of the handicapped belongs to special educators, are reluctant to give up any required courses to another department.

The one area of curriculum revision in which very little change was reported was in the practicum and student teaching experiences. The reasons offered varied from "lack of sufficient mainstreamed settings" to the assumption "that all public school classrooms are mainstreamed, therefore students are having the experience with handicapped." Most projects indicated that changes were desired in practica or student teaching to ensure direct experience with handicapped children, but very little progress had been achieved in this area.

Overall, curriculum revision was well under way, with alteration of existing courses the most prevalent means of achieving change. The professional education sequences, for the most part, had either been revised or were in process.

Culture and Context

One focus of this study was the culture and context in which dean's grant projects were implemented. The literature supports the view that a receptive institutional setting is critical for effective implementation and that the characteristics of the organization, the environment, the history, traditions, and values will affect the process (Arends & Arends, 1978; Baldridge & Deal, 1975; Baldridge et al., 1978; Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Lindquist, 1974; Schein, 1972). Implementation of policies and programs is an "organizational process that [implies] interactions between the project and its setting" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975, p. 10); thus, understanding the implementation process requires understanding how the organization works.

Hipps (1982) suggests that as a first step in the change process, the mission and goals of the institution must be defined and clearly articulated. Then the objectives of the change efforts must be consistent with that mission. To achieve significant change in people and thus institutions, the expressed priorities of the institution must be supported through actions and decisions; for example, the incentive and reward system must support the stated priorities. In essence, the theory-in-action must support the espoused theory. Thus, two foci of this study were the "Mission and Priorities" and the "Incentive and Reward System."

In order to learn more about the institutional values and traditions and how these might have affected implementation of the Dean's Grant Project, information was sought to determine the perceived institutional mission and priorities. Each of the interviewees was asked to rank five functions in order of importance in the institution: teaching; research; publication; service to the university; service to the community.

Another point of interest was the congruence between the institutional mission/priorities and the incentive and reward system. After the interviewees had ranked the above functions, they were asked what criteria were used in tenure and promotion decisions. Interviewees were also asked where and how participation in the dean's grant project fit in with their schema.

The purpose of this line of questioning was to determine whether the incentive and reward system was congruent with perceived institutional mission and priorities, or whether faculty were receiving confusing messages about what was important. A second concern was whether or not participation in innovation or change projects was valued and rewarded.

The following profiles provide a brief description of the culture and context of the sites, with a focus on the institutional mission and priorities, and the incentive and reward system.

Profile: Site #1

The university was described as one that had been "basically a teaching institution," but was changing. In order to attain tenure or promotion, good teaching alone was no longer sufficient; there also needed to be achievement in scholarly productivity and/or service. When asked for their perceptions of the importance in the university of the five functions--teaching, research, publications, university service, and community service--both interviewees ranked teaching last, and this in spite of the description of the university as having been basically a teaching institution.

The schools were now required to generate one-third of their budget from outside sources. The dean saw the need to put time and energy toward creating new programs and new student markets. He was encouraging the faculty to develop new ideas and programs, and to write concept papers. But, "When faced with survival issues and pressures, faculty are less able or willing to engage in innovation projects, except those with immediate survival payoff."

The dean's grant project was seen as helpful in stimulating faculty to think about change, and served as a base for examining the whole teacher preparation curriculum. The funds helped to cover some staff time to meet the minimum teaching requirements. For faculty, work on the dean's grant project was seen as scholarly productivity and would count in promotion/tenure considerations.

Profile: Site #2

This was clearly a teaching institution. The interviewees were unanimous in ranking teaching as the top priority. There was also general agreement that good teaching really counted in tenure and promotion decisions. "If you are a good teacher, you will probably have no problem. If you are a poor teacher, it doesn't matter how many publications you have." Faculty teaching was evaluated by students as well as colleagues. Approximately 63% of the faculty were tenured.

The education programs were located in a department within the College of Arts and Sciences. The education faculty, who were the "least involved of all the faculty" in the other university faculty development programs, became very much involved in the Dean's Grant activities. The Dean's Grant "caused a significant number of faculty in education to involve themselves in special education--not only in special education as a subject matter, but also in the special education of themselves to deal with that subject matter. It [the project] has given a new focus to their work."

When asked whether the project was seen as the dean's or the coordinator's, every interviewee responded that it was "an education department project," one of benefit to the whole department.

The general feeling on this campus seemed to be one of warmth, respect, and supportive collegiality. Faculty involved themselves in the project to different degrees, but without reluctance. They saw the project as benefiting them all, internally with students and colleagues, externally with colleagues in other colleges. As the project entered a dissemination/outreach stage, there was "[institutional] benefit of our becoming a center of expertise in this particular subject."

When asked about the effectiveness of the project in bringing about change and whether the change would be sustained, one faculty member responded, "change...if it is to be enduring, will be slow... people learning and growing together."

Profile: Site #3

When asked about institutional mission and priorities, every respondent ranked teaching first. The university was described as having been basically a teaching institution that was now moving toward more emphasis on research and publication. The promotion process was a multi-level process beginning with departments. Excellence in two of three areas--teaching, research, and service--was required for promotion. Some faculty saw the process as a "sham" and believed that there were "hidden criteria--usually personality."

The school of education experienced an enrollment decline and was faced with the need to develop new programs and "new markets." "Turf issues" arose in curriculum revision projects--who teaches what to whom--with student credit hours being a major concern.

The previous dean of education had not been supportive of innovation and had, in fact, discouraged it. There had been very little outside funding. The current dean was trying to alter this, and was encouraging and supporting the faculty to try something new. The main incentive/reward for developing new programs was "the satisfaction from seeing good programs...make an impact....But it's not easy, it complicates your life." There seemed to be little or no extrinsic reward for innovation or new programs.

The faculty were described as "not very open to change." All but two were tenured; they saw no need to change and, in fact, resisted it. They were "afraid of it," and saw change as something someone else should do. "It's what public schools should do about education of handicapped kids, not what we should do in training teachers to work with handicapped kids." The faculty attitude was "work hard, do a good job, but don't go overboard."

Profile: Site #4

In responding to the question about institutional mission and priorities, all interviewees ranked teaching first. But in discussions about the criteria for promotion, publication appeared to be the major criterion--as one faculty member said, "publication, publication, publication." There was some feeling expressed that the process for promotion in the school of education was "fair and open, but when it goes to the college level, there is lots of hassle. [Faculty] in other parts of the college are unaware of people in the school of education and what is required of them." There was also some feeling that the processes and standards were not consistent but shifted from person to person.

One interesting point to emerge was that, with the budget cutbacks, bringing in grants was considered favorably for promotions. However, the co-coordinator of the dean's grant project did not continue in that role in the third year of the project, ostensibly because of budget cuts in the dean's grant, but also to put in time on those activities which would be rewarded, namely, publications. Apparently, work on the dean's grant project, or any other special project, was recognized and acknowledged only if it could be turned into publications.

At this site, the dean's grant project was perceived as moderately effective. Although there were changes which could be pointed to, there was also some feeling that the faculty were not as involved as they should be. There were also "turf" issues as to who should teach mainstreaming content: "Let's face it--the name of the game is student FTE." One interviewee questioned whether higher education institutions were the appropriate setting for such a project, obviously missing the faculty development objectives; others expressed concern that "special education was taking over the schools."

Some faculty members suggested that in order for change to be effective the faculty must be involved from the beginning and there must be tangible incentives for participation.

Profile: Site #5

The university was basically a teaching institution but was now beginning to expect more in scholarly activity. Service to the university and service to the community were considered an important part of this institution. It is interesting to note that of the eleven sites, this was the only one that ranked research and publication fourth and fifth, respectively. The interviewees were unanimous in ranking teaching first. In matters of tenure and promotion, teaching counted for about 60%, with service, research, and publication constituting the remaining 40%. Participation in the dean's grant project could be considered as service to the university, or as scholarly activity if research and publication were to result from the work.

The university was beginning to feel budget constraints. There had been no faculty raises for the previous two years, and many courses were being taught by part-time faculty. As budget constraints were felt, the faculty began to develop personal/economic concerns, and those who had been involved in academic change efforts seemed to "revert to old patterns."

The dean's grant project was in its final year and many of the projected changes were "in process." When asked about the likelihood of those changes continuing after the grant, one faculty member said: "prior to the financial crunch, I would have said the project had enough momentum to continue to institutionalize the changes. Not now--changes are more likely to be 'faculty specific." He summed it up by saying: "Given the economic situation of the state, and specifically of the university, when you get into survival issues, innovation takes a low priority--survival issues take over."

Profile: Site #6

The university had been primarily a "teaching" institution but was now placing greater emphasis on research and publication. The interviewees were about evenly divided in ranking research and publication ahead of teaching as institutional priorities. The transitional nature of the institution seemed to be reflected in the faculty perception of priorities.

In promotion and tenure considerations, good teaching was assumed as a base; decisions then revolved on the research and publication questions. There was some feeling that tenure decisions often depended on institutional climate and economic conditions, not only on personal and professional qualifications. Faculty participation in the dean's grant project would count toward tenure and promotion only if turned into research and publication.

The faculty had been very active in seeking grants and had had a number of special projects. The dean's grant, with its emphasis on faculty development, differed from other special projects which were service-oriented and field-based. Although there were "turf issues" over who was teaching the special education content, faculty participation was quite high and reactions good. Faculty were willing to "buy in" to someone else's project. One faculty member explained that, "Faculty will become involved if they see some reward... small grant, release time, recognition in tenure/promotion decisions... [they] will put their efforts into areas where there is recognition or backing." The dean suggested that the "dean's grant project should be the model forever to deal with issues.

Profile: Site #7

In terms of institutional mission, teaching was clearly identified as the first priority and was ranked first by all interviewees, followed by research and publication. "This is not a 'publish or perish' place. When we charge more than $7,000 for tuition, we need to pay attention to those students." While good teaching was clearly important, it alone was not sufficient for tenure and promotion; some scholarly activity was also necessary. But "you cannot get promoted without good teaching." Approximately 66% of the education faculty were tenured.

Prior to the dean's grant, there had been some feeling that the special education department was growing too big, too quickly. The project was seen as helping to melt away some of that resentment.

The dean's leadership was a strong theme in this project. The dean was seen as having been actively involved and very supportive at every level. Several of the interviewees commented on this. The dean used "moral suasion; he set the tone. If this man, who is so very busy, saw it as important enough to give his time to it, it must be important for all of us"; "Dean is a real artist at leadership"; "In his own quiet way, he is a real shaker."

Profile: Site #8

The university was moving from a "teaching institution" to one that placed greater emphasis on research and writing. In response to questions about the university's mission, all interviewees at this site ranked teaching behind research and publication. The publish or perish ethic seemed to be gaining prominence. For school of education faculty, this did not seem to present serious concern, since 85% of the faculty were tenured, and all but one or two were at the associate or full professor rank. The younger faculty had been "retrenched."

For tenured senior faculty, the prestige of appointment to the graduate faculty provided one further incentive for faculty to engage in innovation or change. Research and publications or obtaining grants and working on special projects were the major criteria for granting appointment to the graduate faculty.

The dean's grant project took a deliberate, low-key approach in order not to incur competitiveness or the natural jealousies that develop when one group or project seems to have more funds than the others. The institution was described as being open to change, but faculty would resist the change "if it affects what I do." Change was something others experienced. Thus, the approach of the dean's grant project was seen not as "we need to change," but as "how can we make this work within the structure we have."

The project coordinator was a senior, well-respected member of the faculty who "called in all my notes to get people to respond, to participate." The reported faculty reaction to the dean's grant project, based on an internal evaluation, was very positive but was basically a reaction to the coordinator and his status.

Profile: Site #9

When asked about institutional mission and priorities, every respondent ranked teaching third, below research and publication. While good teaching--based on student as well as peer evaluations--was necessary in order to achieve tenure or promotion, it alone was not sufficient; research and publication were also necessary, especially for promotion. "Good teaching is taken for granted--research is necessary to create a scholarly climate."

Even though 80% of the faculty were tenured, the shift in priority from teaching to research seemed to be causing considerable anxiety, particularly among the "old line" teaching faculty. Some felt that the rules were changing mid-stream--they were hired to be teachers and field supervisors and now were to be judged on a different set of criteria.

The dean's grant project was used to effect overall organizational change, as well as to infuse mainstreaming content into courses. The dean saw the project as an "experiment in generic teacher preparation." Participation in or work on the dean's grant project counted toward institutional priorities only if translated into research and writing.

One interesting discrepancy at this site was that faculty referred to "data-based research," meaning experimental research, while the dean sought to encourage a broader approach to research and used the term "systematic inquiry."

Profile: Site #10

The university was in "transition" from a teaching to a research-based institution. The school of education faculty felt that teaching was important, but when it came to decisions on tenure, promotion, and raises, research and publication were the major considerations. The only incentive for faculty to participate in special projects was their own personal interest and satisfaction. There were no institutional extrinsic rewards for such activity.

The dean's grant coincided with all the other changes that were occurring. Some faculty saw it as part of externally mandated change and resisted it on that basis. This faculty was more inclined to make "research based" program changes rather than "rights based."

The dean's grant project took a specifically defined approach--to offer a required three-credit course on the education of the handicapped in mainstreamed settings. It was probably because of the specific objective of this project that the dean's grant survived the massive institutional changes that were occurring. Although there were many changes at this site, in "no way can it be argued that the dean's grant project was an instrument of this organizational change...it was a ripple inside a very large wave." It happened to be going in the same direction, so it wasn't washed out.

Profile: Site #11

The university had been a teaching institution but was in transition, and more emphasis was being placed on scholarly productivity for tenure and promotion. "If teaching is fair and there is scholarly productivity, chances of being promoted are better than if teaching is excellent and there are no publications." Working on the dean's grant project might fit in with the "service" criterion, unless the work was turned into a scholarly publication, which could count toward promotion.

The school of education faculty was described as being "fairly open" to change. Although "not always easily convinced, they are generally cooperative." The school has had a number of special projects over the years which involved a number of different faculty members. The dean encouraged the faculty to develop new programs and write proposals. Writing grant proposals, even if not successful, was acknowledged in consideration of merit pay.

A decrease in enrollment and faculty size over the past few years resulted in about 85% of the faculty being tenured. With such a heavily tenured faculty and little opportunity to hire new faculty, the dean saw faculty development as a major means to achieve change. The dean's grant project, in its eight years on this campus, fit very well in this setting. The dean saw it as unique in its "emphasis on faculty development to implement policy."

Perceived Mission and Priorities

To obtain information on perceived institutional mission and priorities, respondents were asked to rank, in order of importance to the institutions, five functions: teaching, research, publication, service to the university, and service to the community. A number of the interviewees considered research and publication as inseparable and combined them into one category, generally called scholarly productivity. Also, service to the university and service to the community were generally considered together as "service." A synthesis of the ranked responses is presented in Table 4.18.

Table 4.18

Perceived Institutional Mission and Priorities

Project	Teaching	Research	Publication	University Service	Community Service
#1	5	1	2	3	4
#2	1	3	4	2	5
#3	1	2	3	5	4
#4	1	2	3	4	5
#5	1	4	5	2	3
#6	3	1	2	4	5
#7	1	2	3	4	5
#8	3	2	1	4	5
#9	3	1	2	4	5
#10	3	1	2	4	5
#11	1	2	3	4	5

Of the eleven sites, teaching was ranked first at six, third at four, and fifth at one. At the four sites where teaching was ranked third, research and publication were ranked first and second.

At eight of the sites, the interviewees were unanimous in their ranking of the teaching function. Teaching was ranked first at five of those sites, third at two, and fifth at one. At the two sites that ranked teaching third, respondents were consistent in ranking research and publication first and second.

While teaching was ranked first at six sites, at only one was excellence in teaching considered sufficient for achieving tenure or promotion. Others reported that while good teaching was important, it was essential to have a record of scholarly productivity. As one dean put it: "Good teaching is taken for granted; research is needed to create a scholarly climate."

Perceived Effectiveness of Dean's Grant Projects

As a means of obtaining some gauge of the projects' effectiveness on the local level, each respondent was asked the following question: Based on what you [the project] set out to accomplish, how would you rate the overall effectiveness of the dean's grant project on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being the most effective?

The multiple responses were averaged and the mean used as the rating for the site. Table 4.19 presents the rating for each of the eleven sites as reported by the participants. Ratings were clustered between 2.0 (most effective) and 4.0 (least effective). There was a surprisingly high degree of consistency in the responses. At eight of the sites, the range between the highest rating and the lowest did not exceed 1.0. At the other three sites, the range was 2.0, 2.5, and 3.5.

Table 4.19

Perceived Effectiveness

Project	$\overline{X}$ Rating
#1	4.00
#2	2.25
#3	3.35
#4	3.80
#5	2.37
#6	2.60
#7	2.00
#8	2.50
#9	2.90
#10	2.50
#11	3.00

Table 4.20 shows a ranking of the ratings, beginning with the highest. It is interesting to note that the two "youngest" projects, #1 and #3, both in their second year, rank near the bottom on perceived effectiveness. In terms of size, one is in the small category, the other in the middle-sized group. One is publicly supported, the other independent. Both institutions reported major reorganization and budget problems.

Table 4.20

Ranked Effectiveness Ratings

Project	Rating
#7	2.00
#2	2.25
#5	2.37
#8	2.50
#10	2.50
#6	2.60
#9	2.90
#11	3.00
#3	3.35
#4	3.80
#1	4.00

It can be inferred that the two most influential factors at these two sites were the organizational context and years the project had been in operation. Both projects were in operation for only one and a half years at the time of the study; both sites were undergoing major organizational problems. Faculty were preoccupied with survival issues and were less able or less willing to focus on academic innovation. A more mature project, one with more of an experience base, might have been able to surmount the organizational problems more easily.

Summary and Discussion

The sample reflected a wide variety of institutions in terms of size, setting, and type of institution. The institutions ranged in size from less than 3,000 students to more than 23,000, and from small college to major university. The institutions were geographically spread across the country and were located in urban, suburban, and rural settings. They varied by type as to public or independent, some with religious founding. Despite the variations, some similarities became apparent.

The SCDE were undergoing problems of enrollment decline and concomitant budget and staff reductions. All but two of the sites in the study reported enrollment decline and budgetary problems as current issues. Three of the public institutions reported that their existence had been threatened by legislative action. Each seemed to have survived, but with reduced size. Two other sites, independent institutions, reported economic problems severe enough to threaten their survival: one had come through the challenge, the other was in the midst.

One common response to the economic and enrollment problems seemed to be some form of reorganization, either at the institutional or SCDE level. Administrative, programmatic, or organizational changes were being implemented to reflect reduced size or to achieve more efficient operations at seven of the eleven sites. Some sites were in the midst of reorganization, while others had new organizational patterns in place.

This changing environment was having a disquieting effect on the faculty, even though most were tenured. Where reorganization was occurring, faculty seemed to be preoccupied with the reorganization. The faculty seemed unclear about the benefits of reorganization and more than a little concerned as to the effect it would have on them.

The increasing emphasis on research and publication was also causing some anxiety and concern among faculty who saw this as a changing set of institutional standards and priorities. Some of the older faculty felt that they had been hired on the basis of one set of criteria--teaching and field supervision--and were being evaluated on a different set of criteria--research and publication. Being tenured reduced the anxiety somewhat but did not completely allay it.

With the enrollment and economic problems being faced by the SCDE, there was also a growing importance placed on obtaining grants; at some sites, "obtaining a grant" or "bringing in money" was being equated with "research" in tenure or promotion considerations. At most sites, however, work on special projects such as dean's grant projects counted toward tenure and promotion decisions only if it resulted in publications.

Teacher preparation institutions are in transition. The consistency of the responses among faculty when asked about institutional priorities seems to indicate that the messages about what is valued are clear. Where the discrepancy occurs is between what the institutional needs are--developing new markets and new programs, modifying new programs to meet new needs and public mandates--and what is rewarded.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This final chapter includes five sections: (1) summary of the purpose and methodology of the study; (2) distinguishing characteristics of the Dean's Grant Program (DGP); (3) conclusions on the impact of the DGP; (4) implications for change in higher education; and (5) concluding statement.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine how academic innovation and change occur in higher education. The DGP, initiated by the U.S. Department of Education to assist colleges and universities to revise their teacher preparation programs to support implementation of PL 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, provided the model for the study.

Case-study methodology was used to develop a comprehensive, indepth exploration of the DGP in multiple sites. Mini-case studies, or thick descriptions, of projects in eleven sites which reflected a wide range of size, type, and location were developed to form a composite case of the DGP as an approach to change. Data were obtained from multiple sources, including document review, interviews, consultations, and onsite study. Interviews were held with 67 persons (60 onsite participants, plus 7 key leaders in the program).

The data collection and analysis focused on the processes for implementing and managing the projects, and the effect of organizational characteristics and processes on the change efforts. Evidence was also sought to determine the extent of change effected in two program areas central to most projects--faculty development and curriculum revision. In addition, data were sought to identify the distinguishing characteristics of the DGP and the efficacy of this approach for effecting academic change in higher education.

Distinguishing Characteristics of the Dean's Grant Program

During the 1960s and 1970s, federal support for school improvement programs grew dramatically. Many of those programs were directed toward providing services to field-based clientele, and the colleges and universities kept the "special projects" on the periphery of institutional programs. These "temporary organizations" were run by "temporary" faculty employed on "soft money" lines. Thus, when the funding ended, the temporary faculty left and little impact of the program remained.

One focus of this study was to determine how the DGP was similar to or different from other federally supported programs. Onsite study of eleven projects and interviews with seven key leaders of the DGP indicate the following distinguishing characteristics:

Purpose and Goals

The DGP, in anticipation of passage of PL 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Children's Act, was designed to support implementation of a major public policy. The program was initiated on the premises that regular educators needed to know more about handicapped children, and that the dichotomy between regular education and special education needed to be bridged. The competitive grants program was designed around a broad conceptual goal: to encourage colleges and universities to reshape teacher preparation programs to include the learning needs of handicapped children as an integral part.

Design and Focus

The program was designed with a minimum of requirements and regulations and was sufficiently ambiguous to encourage a wide range of activities on the local level. The program aimed to support institutional development, providing the mechanism for infusing the system with knowledge and skills for reconceptualizing the teacher preparation programs. The program encouraged and supported faculty development as a major strategy for achieving the desired curriculum changes. While the grants were relatively small, the institutions were permitted considerable flexibility in using the funds to encourage faculty involvement.

Local Initiative

The DGP, recognizing that enduring change cannot be imposed from without but must come from within, provided maximum opportunity for local institutions to define needs, objectives, strategies, and desired outcomes. Institutions could propose programs ranging from broad organizational change to narrow curricular revisions, depending on local interests and needs. Grants were awarded to the dean as someone with the organizational position and authority to cross departmental barriers and to effect change.

Technical Assistance

A national technical assistance program (National Support Systems Project [NSSP] at the University of Minnesota) was set up at the same time that the DGP was initiated. The NSSP offered technical assistance, consultation and resource materials to local projects, and provided the opportunity for deans and teacher education faculty to come together around common issues through a system of national and regional networks.

Role of OSEP Staff

Program staff in OSEP provided leadership in supporting a developmental effort rather than a program based on number of personnel trained. Also, within OSEP, one staff member served as project officer for DGP, thus becoming an internal advocate for the program.

Summary

The most distinguishing characteristic of the DGP was its focus on institutional development. The program encouraged institutions to strengthen their programs and their faculties in order to support implementation of a major public policy. This differed from most other federally supported programs which were generally field based, service-oriented, and operated on the periphery of the institution. The focus on faculty and curriculum development, which was central to the work of the institution, afforded the potential for more enduring change than projects focused on external clients.

Conclusions

Based on the study of implementation of deans' grant projects at eleven sites and interviews with key leaders, the following conclusions are drawn about the program: (1) impact on faculty development; (2) impact on deans; (3) impact on curriculum revision; (4) institutionalizing the change; and (5) some factors affecting implementation of dean's grant projects.

Impact on Faculty Development

Faculty development and curriculum revision were two program areas central to most dean's grant projects. Typically, faculty development activities were designed to prepare regular education faculty to engage in revising their curricula to include content on education of the handicapped. In studying implementation of the DGP as an illustration of academic change in higher education, data were sought to determine the extent of change achieved in the two central areas--faculty development and curriculum revision.

Faculty development components had two major thrusts: (a) increasing awareness, knowledge, and positive attitudes about PL 94-142 and education of the handicapped; and (b) preparing faculty with the knowledge and skills for revising or modifying the curriculum to incorporate content on education of the handicapped in regular education settings. The size of the groups of faculty involved in faculty development activities ranged from 16 to 50, with the exception of one site which had targeted more than 80 faculty over the eight years of the project.

Faculty development progressed along a continuum from increased awareness, to improved attitudes, to increased knowledge and skill for curriculum revision. Broad segments of the faculty, or possibly even total faculties, were involved in the awareness and attitude levels, while the more intensive knowledge and skill levels were primarily focused on faculty who taught the preservice elementary and secondary education professional sequence, for example, foundations and methods courses.

Based on mini-case studies of the eleven projects, reported outcomes of changes achieved in faculty development indicated:

1. Teacher education faculties had an increased awareness and knowledge of PL 94-142.
2. To a lesser extent, faculty had developed more positive attitudes toward PL 94-142 and education of the handicapped.
3. A smaller group of faculty, those directly involved in the project, had increased knowledge and skill in revising curriculum to incorporate content on the handicapped in regular education preparation programs.
4. The most effective strategies for improving faculty awareness, attitudes, and knowledge were those activities which provided faculty with direct contact with handicapped persons, either by using handicapped persons (or parents of handicapped children) as consultants, or by visiting handicapped or mainstreamed settings.
5. The most effective strategies for engaging faculty in curriculum revision were released time and providing technical assistance through one-on-one consultation.
6. Another effective strategy, although not used extensively, was the mini-grant, small grants from dean's grant project funds awarded to faculty for curriculum revision projects or to initiate related research.

Impact on Deans

One unspecified outcome of the DGP that became apparent during the study was the impact on deans, project coordinators, and other educational leaders. Deans, department chairs, project coordinators and, in some instances, university administrators became learners along with the faculty. In describing the impact on the dean, one coordinator said that

> before the project began, he wouldn't have recognized a handicapped kid if he fell over him, but now he has become an "expert," consulting with other colleges in the area.

Another coordinator said:

> If I could measure on a verbal, behavior, and knowledge scale where the dean moved from the beginning of the project, it would be worth the money....We always had his support, but he didn't really understand it....Now he has become a real advocate.

The benefits were twofold: First, when the dean and other leadership put themselves in a "learner" role, it set the tone to give credibility to the project and legitimacy to faculty development activities. Second, and perhaps more importantly, the dean and other leadership became committed advocates for improving the education of handicapped children. Often, the deans or coordinators assumed a leadership role with other institutions in the area, increasing the range of impact of the DGP.

Impact on Curriculum Revision

The primary aim of the DGP was to effect change in regular teacher preparation curricula to incorporate content on education of

Impact on Deans

One unspecified outcome of the DGP that became apparent during the study was the impact on deans, project coordinators, and other educational leaders. Deans, department chairs, project coordinators and, in some instances, university administrators became learners along with the faculty. In describing the impact on the dean, one coordinator said that

> before the project began, he wouldn't have recognized a handicapped kid if he fell over him, but now he has become an "expert," consulting with other colleges in the area.

Another coordinator said:

> If I could measure on a verbal, behavior, and knowledge scale where the dean moved from the beginning of the project, it would be worth the money....We always had his support, but he didn't really understand it....Now he has become a real advocate.

The benefits were twofold: First, when the dean and other leadership put themselves in a "learner" role, it set the tone to give credibility to the project and legitimacy to faculty development activities. Second, and perhaps more importantly, the dean and other leadership became committed advocates for improving the education of handicapped children. Often, the deans or coordinators assumed a leadership role with other institutions in the area, increasing the range of impact of the DGP.

Impact on Curriculum Revision

The primary aim of the DGP was to effect change in regular teacher preparation curricula to incorporate content on education of handicapped children and youth in regular education settings. All projects had curriculum revision as some part of their activities.

The major curriculum revision efforts focused on the undergraduate, preservice elementary and secondary education programs. To a lesser extent, other undergraduate programs such as vocational education, physical education, and home economics, and graduate level programs such as supervision and administration, and counseling were targeted for revision. Most of the curriculum revision was focused on the professional education sequence of 18 to 36 credits, including foundations and methods courses and practicum experiences. Special education programs were only peripherally involved in curriculum revision to include an expanded view of special education and handicapped children in the least restrictive environment.

The most prevalent approach used for curriculum revision was "infusion," altering existing courses to incorporate content on education of the handicapped. The approaches used to achieve the curriculum revision varied widely, including one-on-one teacher-consultant, interdepartmental faculty study teams, mini-grants to support curriculum revision efforts, and released time. The provision of released time and direct one-on-one consultation assistance for faculty engaged in curriculum revision were the most effective means of achieving the desired changes.

On the basis of the sites studied, conclusions reached about the extent of curriculum change achieved indicated:

1. The professional education sequences of undergraduate preservice elementary and secondary education programs were being modified to incorporate content on education of the handicapped in regular education settings.
2. There has been very little change in the practicum or field experience settings for regular teacher education students.
3. The major approach to curriculum revision was infusion, or alteration of existing courses.
4. There has been some change in the courses or competencies required for graduation, but overall there has been very little in the way of structural change in regular teacher preparation programs.

Institutionalizing the Changes

One of the concerns of any change program is the institutionalization of the change to ensure its continuation beyond the term of the project. The infusion approach to curriculum revision used most often in the DGP offered the potential advantage of integrating content on the learning needs of handicapped and nonhandicapped children as one continuum, and bridging the gap between regular and special education. The potential disadvantage is that those changes would become faculty-specific, and implemented only by the faculty actually involved in the course revision.

In order to assure that the curricular changes effected by dean's grant project activities continue for future generations of teacher education students, a two-pronged approach is suggested: (1) faculty development leading to curriculum modification to integrate content on the learning needs of handicapped in regular education courses, with changes in classroom theory reinforced by field-based experiences; and

(2) structural or policy changes which ensure that those changes become a normal part of the teacher preparation program. The structural or policy changes could be achieved through changes in required courses or, if the program is competency-based, changes in the required competencies.

Some Factors Affecting Implementation of Dean's Grant Projects

The following conclusions are drawn about factors which affected the implementation and change process. Conclusions are presented in two categories: (1) leadership and management, which includes information on initiation and implementation of the project, as well as information on the management of the project once funding was received; and (2) culture and context, which includes information on the effect of institutional features and characteristics.

Leadership. The roles of the dean and project leadership were crucial for effective implementation of dean's grant projects. The dean's active and supportive involvement in the project set the tone, gave the project legitimacy and status within the institution, and helped to bridge departmental and administrative barriers.

In addition to the dean's leadership, the project coordinator's role was extremely important. In most cases, day-to-day management of the project rested with the coordinator. It was essential to have an innovative, self-initiating coordinator who had the respect of the faculty. Role and status of the coordinator seemed not as important as style and personality. A senior faculty member with an aggressive, abrasive manner would meet the same resistance from colleagues as would a junior faculty member with similar characteristics. The skillful, sensitive coordinator who facilitated faculty involvement and supported their feelings of ownership was most likely to be successful.

It was important that the reasons for applying for a grant were clearly understood and agreed upon by all involved. If, for example, the dean wanted to bring about major reorganization, and the special education faculty simply wanted to add a required course in special education for regular educators, confusion and conflict would result.

It was important that the faculty, particularly those in regular education, felt an ownership of the project. At a time when most SCDE were experiencing enrollment decline and staff reductions, the special education departments were expanding. This caused some anxiety and increased competitiveness among departments. If the dean's grant was seen as "another special education project thrust upon us," there was likely to be resistance.

This competitiveness between departments exacerbated turf issues of who teaches what to whom and highlighted the need to bridge departmental barriers. Special education faculty became protective of their content and thought the way to achieve the necessary curriculum change was to add a required course on educating handicapped children in mainstreamed settings, to be taught in the special education department. Regular educators might think education of handicapped kids belonged in special education, but were reluctant to give up any student credit hours.

Culture and context. The culture and context into which the project was implemented was a major factor in the process. Most sites had experienced enrollment decline and budget reductions, some to the point of facing survival issues. When faculty became preoccupied with issues of well-being or survival, they were less likely to become involved in academic change programs. If the threat of survival was severe enough, resistance to change became even stronger.

The overall climate was also a major influence on the change process. At the sites where intense competitiveness and strong political undercurrents were obvious, there was strong resistance to the project. The resistance could be passive or overt, but it complicated the effort to change. At the sites where the climate not only supported but encouraged the kinds of activities conducted by the dean's grant project (i.e., faculty development, instructional improvement, and interdepartmental collaboration), changes were more likely to be achieved.

Most of the sites described themselves as being in transition from basically a teaching institution to one placing more emphasis on research and publication. The institutional incentive and reward systems provided minimal, if any, support for faculty to participate in academic innovation. The message seemed to be that participation would be acknowledged or rewarded only if translated into research and publication.

Another factor affecting the implementation of change programs is the congruence between what is valued by the institution and what is rewarded. For example, if the institution encourages faculty to become involved in instructional improvement programs but awards tenure and promotion on the basis of research and publication, faculty receive conflicting messages. They may become involved in the change effort, but will withdraw if the rewards are given for other activities, and if the cost of participation is greater than the reward. It is interesting to note that faculty frequently see this as a faculty-administration conflict. But it must be remembered that most of the committees making the decisions about tenure and promotion included significant proportions of faculty.

Implications for Change in Higher Education

This study was based on the premise that American higher education must be able to adapt to changing environmental trends and the interests and needs of a changing student population, and that educational leaders are faced with the challenge of planning and managing the change process.

In earlier chapters it was argued that institutions of higher education, as complex organizations with a workforce dominated by autonomous professionals, are resistant to change (Baldridge et al., 1978; Baldridge & Burnham, 1975; Lindquist, 1974, 1978; NIE, 1980a,b; Schein, 1972; Ylvisaker, 1980). It was further argued that American higher education is facing a time of challenge and change, with some of the most powerful forces for change provided by the external environment (Baldridge & Deal, 1983; Cyert, 1983; Hodgkinson, 1983;

Keller, 1983). Thus, as higher education enters an era that requires "better planning, strategic decision making, and more directed change" (Keller, 1983, p. 27), educational leaders are challenged to manage a process of renewal and change in their institutions (Cyert, 1980).

This study of the implementation of the DGP was undertaken to learn more about the process of managing change. Study of the implementation of projects at eleven sites, and cross-site analyses led to conclusions about implementation of the DGP, the changes achieved, and the factors affecting the change process. On the basis of the findings and conclusions of the study, augmented by the literature, a number of implications for change in higher education were identified.

External Environment

It is clear that the external environment provides some of the most powerful forces for change in higher education. Changing demographics, changing needs of the workforce, the expanding use of technology in education and work, and public policies and regulations are all affecting the way colleges and universities conduct their business.

In this study, it was passage of a federal law that guaranteed educational rights to handicapped children that was the initial impetus for the changes enacted by the DGP. The federal law required classroom teachers to have an expanded range of competencies, and this in turn put new demands on the institutions preparing those teachers. The law was augmented by passage of state legislation, changes in teacher certification, judicial rulings, and public advocacy groups.

Of the eleven sites studied, eight were also meeting newly enacted state requirements for teacher certification and/or program accreditation standards, which required regular educators to have competency for education of handicapped children in regular education settings.

What came to bear here was the convergence of a variety of forces: federal law, state regulations, judicial rulings, and public advocacy. This presented some very powerful forces and support for teacher preparation programs to adapt.

One implication that emerges is that colleges and universities are in a crucial interactive relationship with their environments. As environmental needs change, colleges and universities also are faced with the need to change, and the chances of these efforts to succeed are enhanced when they move in the same direction as the larger external trends. To paraphrase one of the deans in the study, the DGP may have been a small ripple in a very large tide but it was going in the same direction, so the changes planned by the DGP were supported by the other, larger trends. While the DGP anticipated the trends and took risks in departing from some established patterns of OSEP-funded programs, it did not buck the tide. The grants were relatively small, and the interactive support of the larger forces and dean's grant projects increased the effectiveness of those monies.

This is not to suggest that colleges and universities should engage only in change that goes with the tide. On the contrary, taking a leadership or proactive approach may be the route to effecting real change. Often this means challenging established norms and patterns, anticipating trends, or even "bucking the tide." While this approach may be fraught with more hazards and require more careful planning and skillful management, it may lead to those changes most important for institutional survival and well-being, and also may contribute toward setting the tone and direction for broader social change.

Change as a Process

The literature on change, supported by the findings of this study, indicate that change is not an event or an achieved status, but an ongoing process. It is a long and slow process involving a heavy investment of time, effort, and energy (Hall, 1978). It involves human beings learning and growing with one another, individually and in groups (Arends & Arends, 1978; Schein, 1972). It also involves interaction with its setting--culture, values, traditions, beliefs, and rewards (Baldridge & Deal, 1983; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Change, a complex and interactive process, is not a linear, sequential process that occurs top-down, or even bottom-up, but rather occurs simultaneously at different levels and in many directions (Arends & Arends, 1978; Earle, 1980; Peters, 1983).

Educational leaders planning change programs must be realistic about the extent of change that can occur in a given period of time. Many of the frustrations and apparent failures of change programs can be related to unrealistic goals and expectations. Educational leaders must recognize that durable change is a complex and interactive process which does not occur quickly, and which requires a long-term design for strengthening processes of communication and strengthening or increasing individual and institutional capacity to sustain the change.

The slowness of the process presents different kinds of frustration for many educational leaders. Keller (1983) refers to

> Kaufman's dilemma--which holds that it is only by a steady accumulation of changes over longer periods that truly extensive transformation [takes] place. Yet when the environment changes rapidly, slow organizational change leads to demise and disaster. (p. 97)

Leadership and Management

Planned or directed changes will not just happen, but require skillful and sensitive leadership. Berman and McLaughlin (1975) pointed out that while a receptive institutional setting was essential, it alone was not sufficient to ensure successful implementation of change--an implementation strategy was necessary. Keller (1983) pointed out the need for colleges and universities to plan for the forces of change that would affect them and to construct an active, ongoing change-oriented management style.

Both from this study and the literature, the following factors essential to effective implementation have been identified:

1. Goals which are clearly articulated and agreed upon by all involved parties.

2. Congruence of the project with the institutional mission and purpose.

3. The active support and involvement of institutional leaders in positions of authority.

4 Active involvement of those affected, creating feelings of ownership.

5. The need for an advocate who is committed to the idea who will continue to strengthen the cause.
6. The need for maintenance of the innovation in order to prevent slippage.
7. An incentive and reward system that acknowledges and supports the change effort.

In current writings, Baldridge and Deal (1983) refute earlier work on change management, including their own, and suggest that there is no special theory of organizational change:

> Good organizational change theory is simply good organizational theory; good organizational change management practices are simply good management. (p. 4)

What this would seem to indicate are definitions of organizational and management theory that include attention to change as an essential and integral part. If so, the findings of this study would agree.

On the basis of the eleven sites studied and the literature, one implication is that it is essential for educational leaders to understand change. At the sites studied, when the deans or project coordinators showed some understanding of the change process and utilized this understanding in managing the project, their chances of success were enhanced.

Faculty Development

> Academic professionals are the most important educational resource of a college or university and their continuous development is of paramount importance to the vitality of their institutions. (Gaff, Festa & Gaff, 1978, p. 8)

Traditionally, college and university faculty are perceived as being at the pinnacle of the American educational system. They are the experts, the dispensers of knowledge; they are the teachers, not the learners. In spite of the growing body of literature on adult development and the faculty development movement of the 1970s, many faculty members consider further development as a reflection of their inadequacies or deficits and are reluctant to participate. They see faculty development as something for their colleagues.

The importance of faculty development as a means of achieving academic change was discussed earlier in Chapter I (Berquist & Phillips, 1975; Christenson, 1982; J. Gaff, 1975; Gaff, Festa & Gaff, 1978; Lindquist, 1978; Schein, 1972), and the complexity of effective development programs was noted (Christenson, 1982; Ducharme, 1981; Hipps, 1982; Woods, 1982). This study supports the claims of the importance of faculty development in change efforts, and the complexity of effective programs. Based on the findings and supported by the literature, the following implications are drawn for faculty development programs in higher education:

1. One important factor for effective faculty development is creating an accepting and supportive climate--one in which continued development of faculty is viewed as a normal and expected activity.

2. The purpose and goals of faculty development programs must be clear and consistent with institutional purposes and mission. To what end faculty are being developed and for what purpose must be clearly understood.

3. Effective faculty development programs will include multiple foci leading to institutional benefits from improved instruction or new programs, and individual benefits for the faculty member. Programs which offer the faculty members professional benefits within the organization, as well as the personal benefit of increased knowledge, have a greater chance for success.

4. The importance of the incentive and reward system supporting faculty development is underscored in the

> literature and endorsed by this study. Faculty will put their time and energies into those activities which will be acknowledged and rewarded.

In summary, faculty will change when (1) the institutional climate supports continued development of faculty as a normal and expected activity; (2) the faculty have motivation to change and believe that the change is desirable; (3) they have positive feedback and psychological safety for taking risks or trying something new; and (4) they are praised, recognized, and rewarded for effectiveness and improvement.

Culture and Context

The most recent literature on organizations speaks to the importance of organizational culture in providing institutional stability (Baldridge & Deal, 1983; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Other writers have pointed out the importance of having an innovation fit in with the organizational setting (Arends & Arends, 1978; Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Lindquist, 1974, 1978; Schein, 1972).

The findings of this study agree with and support the writings on the importance of culture and context in influencing change efforts. While external forces may be the most powerful in stimulating change, the internal culture and context provide a powerful effect on the implementation process.

Implementing change requires a knowledge of the institutional culture--its goals, values, traditions, problems, and issues. Assessing the culture and context, and adapting the change programs to fit the needs of that institution, will greatly enhance the potential for success.

Concluding Statement

It was the purpose of this study to learn about the process of achieving academic innovation in higher education. The basic premise of this study was that change is a comprehensive process encompassing a wide range of interrelated and interactive organizational factors. Those factors included the human aspects of the organization as well as the characteristics and often subtle and elusive processes of the organization which interact with forces in the external environment.

It was the judgment of this researcher that the best way to learn about implementing change was to conduct a study of a change project in multiple sites. The DGP provided a rare opportunity to study change in a variety of institutions, using projects that shared a cross-site programmatic goal--achieving academic change. The purpose of using case-study research methodology was to obtain a close-in, comprehensive view of the implementation of dean's grant projects, and to learn not only about the outcomes but about the processes and factors which influenced the outcomes. Thus, this concluding statement has two foci: (1) comments on the efficacy of the DGP as an approach to change; and (2) comments on change in higher education.

The Dean's Grant Program as an Approach to Change

The DGP was a foresighted effort on the part of OSEP to stimulate social change in support of the implementation of a major public policy. Zaltman et al. (1973) suggest that when an innovation has been adopted by a sufficient number of relevant units within the system to register an impact and to become part of the normative patterns, social change has occurred. By encouraging and supporting change in teacher preparation programs to include education of the handicapped as an integral part, OSEP was encouraging social change. Through 1983, DGP grants were awarded to approximately 275 colleges and universities which prepare about 50% of the nation's teachers. In addition, those institutions have begun to reach out to provide technical assistance and consultation to other institutions which had not received a dean's grant, thereby increasing the range of DGP impact.

Did the DGP effect changes in teacher preparation? Based on this study, it can be said that changes have occurred in curriculum and faculty development. The proposed changes were not all at the "achieved" level, with many still in the "planning" or "in process" stages. As an overall statement from the sites studied, it can be said that the teacher education faculty had increased awareness and knowledge about PL 94-142 and education of handicapped children in regular education settings, and increased skill in curriculum revision. Also, the professional education sequences of teacher preparation programs were being revised to incorporate content on the education of the handicapped.

Can these changes be attributed directly and solely to the DGP? Probably not solely to the DGP. There were too many other, much larger forces at work--mandates of a federal law, changing state regulations and requirements, judicial rulings, parent demands. But it is important to note that the DGP anticipated those trends, recognized the magnitude of change that would be necessary, and provided the stimulus and support for institutions to make the changes necessitated by these other forces.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) and Stake (1978) suggest that case studies provide a basis for naturalistic generalization. Whether or not it can be said that social change has been achieved, it is clear that there is movement in the direction of making changes in teacher preparation programs to include a focus on the education of the handicapped as well as the nonhandicapped. The DGP has served as a catalyst in this effort at social change, using the carrot rather than stick approach.

The DGP, based on a broad conceptual goal with a focus on institutional development, offered an important approach to change. Lindquist (1978) suggests that the most effective means of diffusion of an innovation that involves human interactions, such as curriculum revision, is to describe it in basic concepts to assist local development of a model to fit the existing values, interests, structures, and behaviors. The DGP appears to have done that, as illustrated by the following quotes from two project coordinators:

> One of the things I liked about the dean's grant is that you can work with whatever kind of organizational system your college happens to be in.

* * * * * * * *

> The impact of the project on changing the organization of the college has been profound...[it] will crash down departmental walls...no one is against PL 94-142...and the content unites us.

Another important feature of the DGP was awarding the grant to the dean as an acknowledgement of the importance of a person in a leadership and authority position in effecting change. It was also important to allow the dean flexibility in using a small amount of money to leverage faculty involvement.

The DGP was a departure from the other OSEP-sponsored personnel preparation programs which specified outcomes based on numbers of persons trained. Rather, the DGP supported the development of a new idea and was willing to cross over the boundary of its own discipline --special education--to reach out to regular education. This was a subtle but very valuable tactic considering that implementation of the Law required school and higher education faculties to overcome departmental barriers.

While support of a developmental effort such as the DGP is most commendable, sponsoring agencies should be aware of the risks. As the DGP progressed, the ambiguity of the early program design resulted in some confusion in the field. Initially, the intended outcomes were very general and somewhat vague--to revise teacher preparation programs to prepare regular educators to function effectively in settings where handicapped children had been mainstreamed. What this really meant or the criteria by which it would be measured were not specified. In some ways, this was a very positive feature--it allowed maximum flexibility and local initiative in defining the proposed outcomes. But it also resulted in some confusion as the DGP developed.

In the early stages of the program, outcome measures focused heavily on faculty development and indications of curriculum revision. But as the program developed to more sophisticated levels, criteria for outcome measures began to indicate that data on graduate performance were expected. Some projects were able to provide such data, while others felt that new criteria had been introduced. One caveat for sponsoring agencies might be to try to anticipate these potential areas of confusion and include these kinds of requirements in early program announcements, even if indicating that this type of data requirement is long range.

One further point for sponsoring agencies to consider is the importance of stable funding for projects. This researcher recognizes that OSEP can award only what Congress appropriates, and the early 1980s were difficult budget years for all education programs. For 1982-83, the year in which this study was conducted, DGP grants were reduced by 48% from the 1981-82 level (as were all OSEP personnel preparation programs). This presented a major blow--psychological as well as fiscal--to many of the projects, since there seemed to be some question of continuing federal commitment to PL 94-142. Reinstatement of 30% of the funds after the start of the school year was welcomed, but the funds were probably not used as effectively as if two rounds of budget changes had not occurred.

In addition to curriculum revision and faculty development, another important outcome--anticipated or not--was the development of a cadre of teacher educators, deans, departmental chairs, and faculty who now had more knowledge of and commitment to improving the education of the handicapped, and to seeing education of the handicapped as part of the normal school/class experience. In essence, they have become advocates for the handicapped.

Overall, the DGP represents an important, productive, and useful approach to curriculum revision. One dean suggested that "this is the way to go--it should be the model for all change programs."

Change in Higher Education

The most powerful forces for stimulating change in educational institutions have been, and will most likely continue to be, provided by the external environment--public policies, program accreditation requirements, and major societal trends. While the external environment provides the most powerful forces for stimulating change, it is the internal environment--the organizational culture--which will provide the most powerful influence in effecting the change. The interaction of the external and internal environments create the settings in which educational leaders must plan and manage change. Or, as Baldridge and Deal (1983) say:

> Educational organizations do not merely respond to tangible pressures for change and reform. They are sensitive to and will adjust to local myths and expectations. They adapt to fit internal needs and agendas--they even pretend to conform to outside pressures in order to protect their stable identity. Organizations and their environment engage in a continual dance, each adjusting to the rhythm, tempo, and movement of the other. (p. 9)

Educational leaders generally find themselves in a reactive role--developing or modifying programs in response to external events and influences. While the postsecondary education arena was growing, many institutions were not seriously affected by being in the reactive mode; there was still sufficient demand for their traditional services. But education and higher education are in a new era, one in which they face greater competition and demands for excellence and accountability.

In this environment, college and university leaders are faced with the challenge not only of maintaining their institutions' survival, but of preserving and strengthening the quality of institutional programs. Educational leaders need to adopt a proactive posture toward directing change in their institutions. It will be important to anticipate shifting trends and needs, and to engage in strategic planning to adapt.

> Most colleges and universities have lacked adequate planning, strong internal management, and a transparent set of academic objectives. Higher education has drifted. And in a time of new austerity and growing importance of higher learning and research, drift needs to be replaced by thrift and purpose. If educational institutions are to reverse, or at least slow down, the trend toward outside interventions in their affairs, they must shape their own destinies in ways that are acceptable to the public and its elected leaders. (Keller, 1983, p. 25)

Further, if American higher education wants to assume a leadership role in setting the pace and direction for social change, it will be necessary to anticipate social needs and trends.

As educational leaders engage in planning and directing change, they will find institutional culture--the mission, governance, decision-making processes, values, and traditions--a major influence on the process. The success of any effort directed toward curriculum revision, instructional improvements, and adaptation of delivery formats for new student populations will depend heavily on the effective involvement of the faculty. And the strong traditions of faculty/departmental autonomy and the incentive and reward system are two major factors to be considered.

Traditionally, faculty have been hired on the basis of their expertise in their own disciplines. Often, their professional identities and loyalties are with their own professional communities, external to their place of employment. The faculty member's autonomy and identity with an academic discipline is paralleled and reinforced by traditional departmental autonomy. Yet, innovation frequently involves cooperation and collaboration between and among faculty members and departments. This is counter to the norm of autonomy. Further, although competitiveness is not discussed in the literature as a strong norm, it can be inferred from the attention given to faculty autonomy, the protection of academic freedom, and the prevailing criteria for tenure and promotion. With the strong emphasis on the individual activities of research and publication, faculty members have little reason or incentive to adopt or reinforce innovations of colleagues (who will get the credit) unless the innovation also happens to fit his/her own interests and style.

At a time when colleges and universities are facing many challenges, including the need to develop new student markets and to adapt programs for new student populations, the old incentive and reward patterns seem to be becoming more firmly entrenched. There is need to engage faculty in developing new programs, new content, and new delivery formats, but the traditional activities of research and publication still seem to be what counts. In the present study, it was interesting to note that as SCDE faced internal as well as external threats to their existence, survival often meant adopting the standards of other parts of the university--thus, the increased emphases on research and publication.

As educational leaders engage in directing their institutions' future, one key strategy will be to modify the incentive and reward system. This is not to suggest that scholarly productivity should not be valued, but rather that the incentive and reward system must also recognize the importance of other faculty activities. In order to preserve its integrity, quality of instruction, and to allow for change and growth, an institution needs to support a diversity of faculty skills and activities. There is a need to continue to value and support scholarship as the critical underpinning, or backbone, of institutions of higher education, but there must also be support for faculty who are willing to commit their energies and expertise to developing new ideas and programs, and who are willing to take risks. Peters and Waterman (1982) identify willingness to support innovation and adaptation as critical to organizational success. Educational leaders and those faculty involved in the decision-making processes must take an expanded view of those functions important to institutional excellence. The literature notes the beginning of a trend in colleges and universities to place greater emphasis on and reward faculty who demonstrate a commitment to the institution and a willingness to participate in activities that will enhance the institution's health and survival (Christenson, 1982). Finding effective ways to engage faculty in a process that will lead to the development of new ideas, concepts, and knowledge, new attitudes and value orientation, new skills, and new patterns of roles and relationships may well be one of the most critical challenges facing educational leaders as they attend to the immediate while keeping a vision of the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allison, G. T. *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

Altschuld, J. W., & Downhower, S. G. Issues in evaluating the implementation of Public Law 94-142. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1980, *2* (4), 31-37.

Arends, R. I. Organizational constraints to institutionalizing change in secondary schools and institutions of higher education. In R. P. Walker (Ed.), *The institutionalization of change and inservice in schools and colleges of education*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1978.

Arends, R. I., & Arends, J. H. Processes of change in educational settings: An application to mainstreaming. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Argyris, C., & Cyert, R. M. *Leadership in the '80s: Essays on higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Balderson, F. E. *Managing today's university*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Baldridge, J. V. *Educational innovation: The political dynamics of change*. Unpublished manuscript, May 1980.

Baldridge, J. V. *Power and conflict in the university*. New York: John Wiley, 1971.

Baldridge, J. V., & Burnham, R. A. Organizational innovation: Individual, organizational, and environmental impacts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1975, *20*, 165-176.

Baldridge, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G., & Riley, G. L. *Policy making and effective leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Baldridge, J. V., & Deal, T. (Eds.). *The dynamics of organizational change in education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1983.

Baldridge, J. V., & Deal, T. E. The basics of change in educational organizations. In J. V. Baldridge & T. E. Deal (Eds.), The dynamics of organizational change in education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1983.

Baldridge, J. V., & Deal, T. E. (Eds.). Managing change in educational organizations: Sociological perspectives, strategies and case studies. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

Baldwin, V., Fredericks, H. D., & Templeman, D. Executive summary: Dean's grants projects evaluation, phase 1. Teaching Research, a Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1982.

Bardach, S. The implementation game: What happens after a bill becomes a law. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1977.

Bauer, R. A., & Gergen, K. J. The study of policy formulation. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Behrens, T. R. Dear colleague letter (November 1975). In Redesign for teacher education: Assistance for the planning of dean's grants projects. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1979.

Behrens, T. R. Foreword. In A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of PL 94-142 to teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, April 1980.

Behrens, T. R., & Grosenick, J. K. Dean's Grants projects: Supporting innovation in teacher-education programs. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D., & Chin, R. The planning of change (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. Components of an effective faculty development program. The Journal of Higher Education, March/April 1975, 46 (2), 177-212.

Berlak, H. Values, goals, public policy and educational evaluation. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 261-278.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting educational change. The findings in review (Vol. IV). Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1975.

Bersoff, D. N., & Veltman, E. S. Public Law 94-142: Legal implications for the education of handicapped children. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1979, *12* (4), 10-22.

Byford, E. M. Mainstreaming: The effect on regular teacher training programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1979, *30* (6), 23-25.

Centra, J. A. Types of faculty development programs. *The Journal of Higher Education*, March/April 1978, *49* (2), 151-162.

Chin, R., & Benne, K. D. General strategies for effecting changes in human systems. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, R. Chin, & K. E. Corey (Eds.), *The planning of change* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

Christenson, D. D. Changes in higher education: Forces and impacts. In G. M. Hipps (Ed.), *Effective planned change strategies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Clair, J., Hagerty, G., & Merchant, D. *Redesign for teacher education: Assistance for planning Dean's Grants projects*. Washington, DC: American Association of College for Teacher Education, 1979.

Cohen, D. K. Politics and research: Evaluation of social action programs in education. *Review of Educational Research*, 1970, *40*, 213-238.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1972, *17* (1), 1-25.

Corrigan, D. C. Political and moral contexts that produced PL 94-142. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1978, *29* (6), 34-38.

Cronbach, L. J. & Associates. *Toward reform of program evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Datta, L-E. Changing times: The study of federal programs supporting educational change and the case for local problem solving. *Teachers College Record*, 1980, *82*, 101-116.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. *Corporate Cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1982.

Dill, D., & Friedman, C. An analysis of frameworks for research on innovation and change in higher education. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 411-435.

Ducharme, E. R. Faculty development in schools, colleges, and departments of education. Journal of Teacher Education, September/October 1981, 32 (5), 30-34.

Earle, J. M. Toward a grounded theory of educational innovation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 42/02, 671-A. (University Microfilms No. 8116472)

Easton, D. E. A framework for political analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Washington, DC: Author, June 1983.

Eisner, E. W. Educational connoisseurship and educational criticism: Their form and functions in educational evaluation. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 1976. (Xeroxed)

Elmore, R. F. Organizational models of social program implementation. In D. Mann (Ed.), Making change happen. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Farrar, E., De Sanctis, J. E., & Cohen, D. K. The lawn party: The evolution of federal programs in local settings. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62, 167-171.

Farrar, E., De Sanctis, J. E., & Cohen, D. K. Views from below: Implementation research in education. Teachers College Record, Fall 1980, 77-100.

Filstead, W. J. (Ed.). Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Florio, D. H., Behrmann, M. M., & Glotz, D. L. What do policy makers think of educational research and evaluation? Or do they? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, November/December 1980, 1 (6), 61-87.

Fullelove, J. P. The politics of higher education during the Johnson administration. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, February 28, 1973.

Gaff, J. G. *Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional, and organizational development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Gaff, S. S., Festa, C., & Gaff, J. G. *Professional development: A guide to resources*. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Gazvoda, M. W. A descriptive and statistical study of the dean's grant projects: Federal support for change in teacher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1981, *42*, 2621A-2622B. (University Microfilms No. 81 25426)

Gideonse, H. Improving the federal administration of educational programs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1980, *2*, 61-70.

Gideonse, H. Designing federal policies and programs to facilitate local change efforts. In R. Herriott & D. Gross (Eds.), *Dynamics of planned educational change*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1979.

Gideonse, H. Peer teaching and participation. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Gilberts, R. D., & Weisenstein, G. R. Curricular change and institutional reorganization. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project,1978.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. Discovery of substantive theory: A basic strategy underlying qualitative research. In W. J. Filstead (Ed.), *Qualitative methodology: Firsthand involvement with the social world*. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Gliedman, J., & Roth, W. *The unexpected minority: Handicapped children in America*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980.

Goodlad, J. I. *The dynamics of educational change: Toward responsive schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Greenwood, P. et al. *Federal programs supporting educational change*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1975.

Grosenick, J. K., & Reynolds, M. C. (Eds.). *Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Gross, E., & Grambsch, P. V. Changes in university organization, 1964-1971. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., & Bernstein, M. Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

The Group for Human Development in Higher Education. Faculty development in a time of retrenchment. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1974.

Guba, E. G. Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1978.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Hagerty, G. Personal communication, July 1982.

Hagerty, G., Behrens, T., & Abramson, M. The dean's grant initiative: Fostering an agenda of shared responsibility in teacher education. In B. Sharp (Ed.), Dean's grant projects: Challenge and change in teacher education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1982.

Hall, G. E. (Ed.). A national agenda for research and development in teacher education 1979-1984. Austin: University of Texas, 1979.

Hall, G. E. Facilitating instructional change: Using the individual as the frame of reference. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Hall, G. E. The concerns-based adoption model: A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin: University of Texas, 1974.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., & Brown, G. Issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development center for Teacher Education, 1980.

Halperin, S. A guide for the powerless: And those who don't know their own power. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1981.

Halperin, S. The educational arena. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1980, 2, 27-36.

Hartle, H. *Teaching handicapped students in the regular classrooms: State preservice certification requirements and program approval standards*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, August 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 513)

Harvey, J. Legislative intent and progress. *Exceptional Children*, 1978, *44*, 234-237.

Haughton, D. C., & Cochrane, P. Modular instructional system development. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Herriott, R. E., & Gross, D. *The dynamics of planned educational change*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1979.

Higgins, S., & Barresi, J. The changing focus of public policy. *Exceptional Children*, 1979, *45* (4), 270-277.

Hipps, G. M. Faculty and administrative development. In G. M. Hipps (Ed.), *Effective planned change strategies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Hodgkinson, H. L. What's still right with education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1982, *64* (4), 231-235.

Hodgkinson, H. L. *Getting steerage on the 1980s: What issues will emerge in U.S. consciousness?* Paper presented at the Washington Policy Seminar, Washington, DC, November 1982.

Hodgkinson, H. L. *Guess who's coming to college: Your students in 1990*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1983.

House, E. R. *The logic of evaluative argument*. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, 1977.

House, E. R. (Ed.). *School evaluation: The politics and process*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1973.

Howsam, R. B., Corrigan, D. C., Denemark, G. W., & Nash, R. J. *Educating a profession*. Washington, DC: The Bicentennial Commission for the Profession of Teaching of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Institute for Educational Leadership. *Educational policy in the Carter years*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, 1978.

Institute for Educational Leadership. Federalism at the crossroads: Improving educational policy making. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, 1976.

Institute for Educational Leadership. Perspective on federal educational policy: An informal colloquium. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, 1976.

Jabker, E. H., & Halinski, R. S. Institutional development and faculty rewards. The Journal of Higher Education, July/August 1978, 49 (4), 316-328.

Johnson, D. H., Howie, P. A., & Corcoran, E. L. Curriculum revision revisioned. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Kast, F. E., & Rosenzweig, J. E. Organizations and management: A systems and contingency approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Keller, G. Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, 1983.

Kuhn, T. S. The structure of scientific revolutions (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Ladd, D. R. Change in educational policy: Self studies in selected colleges and universities. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Levine, A. Why innovation fails. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1980.

Lindquist, J. (Ed.). Increasing the impact of social organizations funded by grantmaking organizations. Battle Creek, MI: The W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1979.

Lindquist, J. Political linkage: The academic innovation process. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 45 (5), 323-343.

Lindquist, J. Strategies for change. Berkeley, CA: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

Lucas, W. A. The case survey method: Aggregating case experience. Santa Monica, CA: The Rank Corporation, 1974.

Lynn, E., Jr. The analyst as craftsman. Bulletin, Fall/Winter, 1979-80, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Malinowsk, B. Argonauts of the western Pacific. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1922.

Mann, D. (Ed.). Making change happen? New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Mann, D. The politics of training teachers in schools. Teachers College Record, 1976, 77 (3), 323-338.

Marieneau, C. A. Bridging theory and practice in adult development and planned change: Case studies in higher education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1982, 43, 1012A-1013A. (University Microfilms No. DA 822 1310)

Martorana, S. V., & Kuhns, E. Managing academic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Meyen, E. L. Mainstreaming colleges of education. Teacher Education and Special Education, 1979, 2 (2), 5-8.

Miller, S. I. Social research and educational policy making: Some conceptual and methodological issues. In A. C. Ornstein & S. I. Miller (Eds.), Policy issues and education. Lexington, MA: D.C. Health, 1976.

Millet, J. D. New structures of campus power. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Millstein, M. Impact and response: Federal aid and state education agencies. New York: Teachers College Press, 1976.

Mosher, E. K. The politics of higher education during the Nixon administration. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, February 25-March 1, 1973.

Mosher, E. K. et al. Pursuing equal educational opportunity: School politics and the new activists. New York: Columbia University, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 179 625)

Mulkeen, T. A. Higher education in the coming age of limits: An historical perspective. Journal of Higher Education, 1981, 52 (3), 310-316.

Murphy, J. T. Getting the facts: A fieldwork guide for evaluators and policy analysts. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear, 1980.

Murphy, J. T. State education agencies and discretionary funds: Grease the squeaky wheel. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1974.

Nakamura, R. T., & Smallwood, F. *The politics of policy implementation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Nash, N., & Culbertson, J. *Linking processes in educational improvement: Concepts and applications*. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration, 1977.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1983.

National Institute of Education. *Grants for research on institutions of postsecondary education*. Washington, DC: Author, 1980(a).

National Institute of Education. *Research and plan for postsecondary organization and management studies*. Washington, DC: Author, 1980(b).

National Support Systems Project. *The dean's grants projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1980.

National Support Systems Project. *Regular teacher preparation and Public Law 94-142*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1979.

Okun, K. A. Deans as change agents: Testing assumptions of the Dean's Grant Program. In C. R. Sivage, J. M. Bryon, & K. A. Okun (Eds.), *Politics, power, and personality: The role of deans in dean's grant projects*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1982.

Okun, K. A. Deans' perception of their ability to promote change in schools of education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1981, *42/02*, 488-A. (University Microfilms No. 8116312)

Patton, M. *Qualitative methods: A social primer*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Quigley, M. S. A study of the political dimension of private higher education: Government relations of five universities and a consortium in Washington, DC (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1975). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, *36/03*, 1334A. (University Microfilms No. 75-20221).

Rader, B. T. Competencies for mainstream teachers: An analysis. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Radin, B. A. Implementation, change, and the federal bureaucracy: School desegration policy in HEW, 1964-1968. New York, Teachers College Press, 1977.

Reynolds, M. C. Basic issues in restructuring teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29 (6), 25-29.

Reynolds, M. C. The future of mainstreaming: Next steps in teacher education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1982.

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Futures of education for exceptional students: Emerging structures. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Reynolds, M. C. A look to the future in teacher education. Teacher Education and Special Education, 1979, 2 (2), 9-10.

Rich, J. M. New directions in educational policy. Lincoln, NB: Professional Educators' Publications, 1974.

Rist, R. C. Ethnographic research in the study of education: An overview of practices and policies. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, 1982.

Rist, R. C. On the means of knowing qualitative research in education. New York University Education Quarterly, 1979, 10 (4), 17-21.

Rist, R. C. On qualitative research: Issues of design, implementation, analysis, ethics, and applicability--a bibliography. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, College of Human Ecology, 1978.

Rist, R. C. On the relations among educational research paradigms: From disdain to detente. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1977, 7 (2), 42-49.

Rist, R. C. et al. On the shaping of educational policy: The transition from administrative/political to judicial decision-making. In Education, social science, and the judicial process. New York: Teachers College Press, 1977.

Rivlin, A. M. Systematic thinking for social action. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute, 1971.

Rivlin, A. M., & Timpane, M. P. (Eds.). *Planned variation in education: Should we give up or try harder?* Washington, DC: Brookings Institute, 1975.

Rothman, E., & Rothman, T. (Eds.). *Promoting innovations and change in organizations and communities: A planning manual*. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Sarason, S. B. *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.

Schafer, R. C., & Duncan, J. R. Implications of personnel preparation planning in special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 1979, *2* (2), 30-34.

Schlechty, P. C., & Turnbull, A. P. Bureaucracy on professionalism: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1978, *29* (6), 34-38.

Schein, E. H. *Professional education: Some new directions* (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Schmuck, R. A., Runkle, P. J., Saturen, S. L., Martell, R. T., & Derr, C. B. *Handbook of organization development in schools*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield, 1972.

Scribner, J. D. (Ed.). *The politics of education*. The Seventy-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Scribner, J. D., & Englert, R. M. The politics of education: An introduction. In J. D. Scribner (Ed.), *The politics of education*. Chicago: NSSE, 1977.

Sharp, B. L. (Ed.). *Dean's grant projects: Challenge and change in teacher education*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1982.

Sharp, B. L. Unresolved issues for teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1978, *29* (6), 39-41.

Sikes, W. W., Schlesinger, L. E., & Seashore, C. N. *Renewing higher education from within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Sivage, C. R. Advocates of change: An analysis of deans' roles as directors of dean's grant projects. In C. R. Sivage, J. M. Bryson, & K. A. Okun (Eds.), *Politics, power, and personality; The roles of deans in Dean's Grant Projects*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1982.

Sivage, C. R., Bryson, J. M., & Okun, K. A. (Eds.). Politics, power, and personality; The roles of deans in Dean's Grant Projects. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1982.

Sivage, C. A., Reinhard, D., & Arends, R. The dean's role in the Dean's Grant Projects: Director and advocate. In The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1980.

Sprinthall, N. A., & Sprinthall, L. T. Adult development and leadership training for mainstream education. In D. C. Corrigan & K. R. Howey (Eds.), Special education in transition: Concepts to guide the education of experienced teachers. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1980.

Stake, R. E. The case study method in social inquiry. Educational Researcher, 1978, 7 (2).

Stake, R. E. Objectives, priorities, and other judgment data. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 181-212.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Webster, W. J. An analysis of alternative approaches to evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1980, 2, 5-20.

Thompson, J. T. In search of excellence: A conversation with Tom Peters. Training and Development Journal, 1983, 37 (8), 16-22.

Thompson, J. T. Policymaking in American public education: A framework for analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Trohanis, P. L. (Ed.). Strategies for change. Chapel Hill, NC: Technical Assistance Development System, 1982.

Turnbull, H. R. III, & Turnbull, A. P. Free appropriate public education: Law and implementation. Denver: Love, 1978.

Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. Making the grade. New York: The Twentieth Centure, 1983.

Uehling, B. S. Meeting the demands of the future. Educational Record, 1978, 59 (4), 377-387.

Weaver, J. F. (Ed.). Educational policy. Danville, IL: Interstate, 1975.

Weick, K. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. In J. V. Baldridge & T. Deal (Eds.), The dynamics of organizational change in education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1983. (Reprinted from Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1978, 23, 541-552.

Weisenstein, G. R., & Gall, M. D. Adapting teacher education to include mainstreaming: Dean's Grant Projects. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29 (6), 22-24.

Weiss, C. H. (Ed.). Evaluating action programs: Readings in social action and education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972(a).

Weiss, C. H. Evaluation research: Methods for assessing program effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972(b).

Weiss, R. S., & Rein, M. The evaluation of broad aimed programs: Difficulties in experimental design and an alternative. In C. H. Weiss (Ed.), Evaluating action programs: Readings in social action and education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

Welch, W. W. (Ed.). Case study methodology in educational evaluation. Proceedings of the 1981 Minnesota Evaluation Conference. Minneapolis: Minnesota Research and Evaluation Center, 1981.

Welch, W. W. (Ed.). Educational evaluation: Recent progress, future needs. Proceedings of the 1980 Minnesota Evaluation Conference. Minneapolis: Minnesota Research and Evaluat5ion Center, 1980.

Whitmore, J. R. What have we learned from the Dean's Grant Projects? In The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1980.

Wiles, D. K. The process of change: Revisiting general premises of politicized adaptation. Educational Planning, 1977, 3, 34-43.

Wilson, B. M. Implementing a federally funded college-based teaching model in an urban public school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, New York, NY, 1983.

Woods, B. G. Dean's grant projects: A vehicle for faculty development. In B. L. Sharp (Ed.), Dean's Grant Projects: Challenge and change in teacher education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Support Systems Project, 1982.

Zaltman, G. Processes and phenomena of social change. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Zaltman, G., & Duncan, R. Strategies for planned change. New York: Wiley, 1977.

Zaltman, G., Duncan, R., & Holbek, J. Innovations and organizations. New York: Wiley, 1973.

APPENDIX

"Dear Colleague" letter announcing Dean's Grant Program

Sample letter to deans inviting their participation in this study

Sample interviewee participation form

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

July 29, 1974

Dean
School/College of Education

Dear Colleague:

This past year the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), through its Division of Personnel Preparation (DPP), has initiated what we feel to be a very exciting and timely personnel preparation program. The program pertains to providing specialized preparation for regular education personnel, e.g., elementary educators, secondary educators, principals, supervisors, superintendents, career/vocational educators, and other personnel in those instructional competencies which are necessary for providing effective educational service to handicapped children placed in regular classrooms. Although we, naturally, have a basic interest in handicapped children, there is growing evidence that a much larger group of children (estimates range from 25-40% of all children)will display variations in learning or behavioral styles which will require specially designed educational programs, for at least short periods of schooling. Our feeling is that too many teachers report feeling inadequate in dealing with these variations, and so feel powerless to teach gifted children, minority group children, highly active children, etc. The newest impetus for a change lies with the increasing practice of "mainstreaming." In its simplest form, this practice refers to the placement of handicapped children with regular education teachers, with supportive services from special educators, for most or a portion of a typical school day. In order for the pupil to benefit from such placement, the regular educator must be sensitive to the unique needs of handicapped children, and also be aware of instructional procedures which are effective with a handicapped learner.

By necessity, the majority of our efforts to date have been in the provision of inservice training to regular educators, and the formulation of statewide study committees to review regular educator certification requirements and to recommend changes in these which would enable a regular educator to more effectively manage a learning environment for a handicapped child. Many individuals from colleges and universities have served as participants on these committees. The intent of the study committee is to stimulate changes in the undergraduate and graduate preparation of regular educators.

Page 2 - Letter to Dean School/College of Education

While this may be an effective strategy, additional efforts are probably needed. That is, some resources should be made available to the Dean for this important effort.

The purpose of this brief communication, therefore, is to enlist your assistance as a change agent in the preparation of regular educators by reforming training sequences and curricula to include competencies for responding to the individual challenges of children, including the handicapped, who require additional attention. If you are interested in participating in this pioneer effort, we would welcome an application for a planning/operational grant. The project director of the current BEH/DPP training grant has all of the necessary application forms and materials. We anticipate that applications which are approved for funding will be in dollar amounts sufficient to employ an administrative assistant, secretarial support, consultants, and to provide a travel allowance for the project staff. There are several program-related aspects which the application should contain. These are as follows:

1. The Project Director must be the Dean.

2. The application must contain a plan for the revision or reform of the regular education preparation programs in terms of responsiveness to the educational needs of handicapped children. Such revisions must extend beyond the addition of one or two required courses to include significant practica experiences, and should provide the teacher with skills and experiences necessary to feel competent to face the individual challenges of children who vary from "average" behavior. Innovative approaches to this curriculum revision task are welcomed.

3. In order to promote the development of number 2, the faculty in the special education program should be active participants in those functions, e.g., committees, which the Dean or faculty governing body may implement. While the faculty in special education will provide significant contributions, it will also be crucial that other faculties in the University or College who conduct programs for preparing personnel to serve the handicapped, e.g., speech and hearing, psychology, psychiatry, etc., be involved in the planning and implementation of such programs.

4. The application should contain a description of a three-year time line or plan in which the objectives of the project will be accomplished.

5. Expected outcomes of the project should be delineated. For example, the revision of the preparation curricula or programs should be specified as to type of changes, potential impact upon the School/College operations, anticipated benefits to those schools in which graduates are usually employed, and projected benefits for the handicapped and other children whom the program's graduates will serve.

The BEH/DPP staff members hope that you will consider participation in this vital effort. All of us will look forward to hearing from you, and to the opportunity of working with you in the future. You have my best wishes for success.

Sincerely,

Edwin H. Martin
Acting Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

[Sample letter to deans inviting their participation]

October 28,1982

Dear:

I am pleased that you have agreed to participate in my study of academic innovation and the process of change in higher education, using the Dean's Grant Program as the model. An abstract of the study is enclosed for your information. This study will serve as my doctoral dissertation at Fordham University Graduate School of Education, and has been awarded a grant from the Student Initiated Research Program, Special Education Programs, OSERS, U.S. Department of Education.

As I indicated on the phone, I will be using case study research methodology, with intensive onsite interviews as the major means of data collection. When I visit your campus, I would like to schedule interviews (1-1½ hrs) with you, the project coordinator, at least one faculty member who has been closely affiliated with the project, and one other faculty member from the "targeted" group. When we talk further about the date for my site visit, we can also discuss selection of the faculty participants. I will contact ____________________ about setting a date for my visit.

I will also be reviewing proposals, progress reports, and other relevant project and institutional documents and materials. As a first step, I would appreciate your sending to me copies of your dean's grant proposals, any reports or materials resulting from the project, and any descriptive information on the university. A catalogue(s) would be especially helpful. I would appreciate your sending the materials to my home, 106 Morningside Drive, New York, New York, 10027.

Eleven institutions, selected by stratified random sampling procedures from the national sample, will be included in the study. If you or any of your colleagues have any questions about this study, please do not hesitate to call me. My office and home phone numbers are on my resume, a copy of which is enclosed in order to provide you with a little more information about my background.

Let me say again that I am pleased that __________ University will be part of my study. I appreciate your cooperation and assistance. I look forward to working with you and members of your faculty.

Sincerely,

Angela M. Covert

Dissertation Mentor:
Dr. Thomas A Mulkeen
Fordham University
Graduate School of Education

[Sample interviewee participation form]

Planned Change in Higher Education
A Study of the Process of Implementation of Deans' Grants as an Approach to Academic Innovation

Name of Institution: ____________________

Interviewee: ____________________

Role in Relation to Project:

Comments:

Date:

The purpose of this project is to study academic innovation and the process of change in higher education, using the Dean's Grant Program as the model. The study will focus on two central program areas of dean's grants--faculty development and curriculum revision.

Eleven projects, chosen by stratified random sampling procedures from the national sample will be included in the study.

A major means of data collection will be through onsite interviews with a variey of persons involved with the project.

Your privacy will be protected and all information, opinions, and attitudes expressed by you will be treated confidentially. Whatever information you give to the interviewer will not be attributed to you in reports, nor will it be released to any of your colleagues.

Names of participating institutions and personnel will not be disclosed. In reporting results of the study, site descriptions, project personnel, and other descriptive information will be masked to protect confidentiality.

This study will serve as my doctoral disseertation at Fordham University Graduate School of Education, and has been awarded a student initiated research grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Special Education Programs.

I will be pleased to answer any questions about the study.

Please sign below indicating that you have been informed of the confidentiality of the the study and your willingness to participate. Thank you.

____
Name

____
Institution

____
Date

____
Angela M. Covert

THE DEAN'S GRANT PROGRAM:
AN APPROACH TO ACADEMIC CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Angela Manetti Covert
Fordham University, 1984

Mentor: Thomas A. Mulkeen, PhD

The purpose of this study was to increase understanding of how academic innovation and change occur in higher education and the processes for effectively managing change. The focus of the study was schools/colleges/departments of education (SCDE). The Dean's Grant Program (DGP), initiated by the U.S. Department of Education in 1975 to assist SCDE to revise their teacher preparation programs in support of the implementation of PL 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, provided the model for examining the change process. The DGP was designed to support institutional development while at the same time permitting considerable flexibility and encouraging faculty involvement. The study focused specifically on two program areas central to most dean's grant projects: faculty development and curriculum revision.

The basic premises of this study were that change is a comprehensive, interactive process involving individuals as well as organizational and environmental factors, and that effective implementation of

academic innovation depends on both the implementation strategy and the setting.

Case-study methodology was used to develop a comprehensive, indepth exploration and holistic analysis of a set of complex variables and their interactions. A national sample of eleven dean's grant projects, chosen by stratified random sampling procedures, was selected for onsite study. One reason for using case-study methodology was to obtain a close-in, comprehensive view of the projects and to learn not only about the outcomes, but about the processes and factors that influenced the outcomes.

Data were obtained from multiple sources: document review, consultations, interviews, and onsite interviews with project leadership and faculty. Data were analyzed qualitatively, both within-site and cross-site, leading to conclusions about the impact of the DGP and implications for change in higher education.

The case studies demonstrated that change had occurred: faculty were more aware of and knowledgeable about PL 94-142 and education of the handicapped, and teacher preparation curricula were being revised to incorporate content on the handicapped. The studies further showed that change is a slow and complex process, and that the external environment, in interaction with the organizational culture, exerts a powerful influence on change and requires skillful leadership in managing the change efforts.

VITA

Name	Angela Manetti Covert
Date of Birth	September 25, 1934
Place of Birth	Monessen, Pennsylvania
High School	Monessen High School, Monessen, Pennsylvania
Graduated	June 1952
College	California State College, California, Pennsylvania
Degree	Bachelor of Science, Secondary Education (Mathematics, Science)
Conferred	June 1956
College	Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
Degree	Master of Arts, Student Personnel Administration
Conferred	May 1958
College	Fordham University, New York, New York
Degree	Doctor of Education, Administration, Policy, and Urban Education
Present Position	Coordinator, New York City Educational Policy Fellowship Program